

ize appropriations to and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HICKENLOOPER submitted two amendments (Nos. 1072 and 1073), intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 11380) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS BY PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to announce the scheduling of certain bills for public hearings before the Public Lands Subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

On June 29 and 30, I expect to take up H.R. 5198, to provide temporary authority for the sale of certain public lands, and H.R. 5159, to authorize and direct that certain lands administered by the Secretary of the Interior be classified in order to provide for their disposal or management under principles of multiple use.

On July 1 and 2, I anticipate taking testimony on H.R. 8070, the bill to provide for a Public Land Law Review Commission.

On July 6 and 7, hearings have been scheduled on S. 606, to authorize the establishment of the Tocks Island National Recreation Area. This measure has been pending before the subcommittee since January 1963, and is the subject of considerable interest in the States of Pennsylvania and New Jersey.

Mr. President, it is my hope and expectation to schedule hearings on the very important Assateague Island proposal some time in the early part of August. A more definitive date will be announced on that at a very early time.

I urge that any persons interested in testifying on any of these matters contact the staff of the committee at the earliest possible date so that a complete record can be made on all of these proposals.

NOTICE OF RESCHEDULING OF HEARINGS ON IMMIGRATION BILLS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, on June 17, 1964, it was announced that hearings on pending immigration and naturalization legislation would be resumed on June 25, 1964. This is to announce that the hearing on that date has been rescheduled and will be held on Monday, June 29, 1964, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO AMEND THE FEDERAL BAIL LAWS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILLS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, a few weeks ago the senior Senator from Indiana brought into sharp focus the discomforting fact that our Nation, which is dedicated to making justice equal and accessible to all, has tolerated Federal bail procedures under which the amount of money a citizen can raise controls his pretrial freedom—a time during which, I might emphasize, he is presumed innocent.

As the senior Senator's statement points out, I, along with Senators BAYH, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, JOHNSTON, DOUGLAS, KENNEDY, LONG of Missouri, HRUSKA, and FONG, have introduced three proposals to correct the injustices that our Federal bail laws impose upon indigent American citizens. It is imperative that these laws be corrected, for, as the senior Senator from Indiana emphasized, "justice should never be weighted against the poor just because of their poverty."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Indiana be added as a cosponsor to S. 2838, S. 2839, and S. 2840 at the next printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 23, 1964, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1828) to amend the joint resolution establishing the Battle of Lake Erie Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission so as to authorize an appropriation to carry out the provisions thereof.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

Editorial entitled "The Credibility Gap," published in Aviation Week & Space Technology for June 15, 1964, dealing with the controversy over news management by the administration.

By Mr. AIKEN:

Excerpt of speech entitled "What an Industry," delivered by Norman Kraeft, national agricultural editor, American Broadcasting Co., at dairy industry banquet, Hotel Bradford, Boston, Mass., on June 8, 1964.

WAR IN ASIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this morning I listened to the briefing before the Foreign Relations Committee by the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. After listening to that briefing, I said to the Secretary of Defense and to the Chairman of

the Joint Chiefs of Staff that I am now convinced that the greatest threat to the peace of the world is the United States. I am convinced that if the United States continues to follow the course of action thoroughly implied by that briefing, we are headed straight for a major war in Asia, and we will be hated for the next 500 years by the overwhelming majority of mankind. Further I am convinced that if we follow the clear implications of the briefing of this morning, we will go down in history as the nation chiefly responsible for scuttling the United Nations, for, as I have said for these many past weeks on the floor of the Senate, we are acting outside the framework of international law in southeast Asia. After the briefing this morning, I am satisfied that at the present time we have no intention of acting within the framework of international law. Instead of living up to our treaty commitments as well as the obligations of the President under the Constitution of the United States, we are making war in Asia. In my judgment, we are headed straight for a major war in Asia unless Red China runs for cover.

I say to the American people that a war in Asia will be stopped only if the people of the United States stop it. If they do not stop it, hundreds of thousands of their boys are going to die before we are through with a bogged-down war in Asia. Let the American people not forget that France lost 240,000 of the flower of her manhood in a war in Indochina. I am at a loss to understand why we have developed the grandiose delusion that the United States can conduct a major war in Asia and not suffer the loss of hundreds of thousands of American boys.

Mr. President, we have the duty to exhaust all the potentials of international law. Perhaps all the potentials of international law will not save us from a war; but we have the clear duty to write in history a glorious page that at least we attempted to do so.

Mr. President, the fact remains that the White House is not attempting to go through the United Nations and to keep faith with what we prate and profess is our dedication to the substitution of the rule of law for the rule of military might. The American rule of military might as is true of military might envisioned by any other country is still the rule of the jungle. There is no justification for the course of action the United States is following in southeast Asia which is threatening the peace of the world.

AIR POLLUTION

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, Americans are more and more conscious of the impact of air pollution on their lives. Recognition of this problem led to the enactment of the Clean Air Act of 1963. The act, in turn, has focused public attention on the need for action to curtail harmful air pollution.

One of the best articles I have seen on air pollution was printed recently in

Labor's Economic Review. Prepared by the Department of Research of the AFL-CIO, and entitled "The Polluted Air We Breathe," the article presents a balanced statement on the problems of air pollution and the steps we need to take to abate this hazard to health and property.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, "The Polluted Air We Breathe," be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE POLLUTED AIR WE BREATHE

Thousands of years ago, one of our ancestors ran coughing and choking out of a smoke-filled cave. This was the small, unrecorded but ultimately significant beginning of manmade pollution of the air we breathe, one of the most urgent environmental problems of America today.

An Englishman named John Evelyn wrote in 1661 of the smoke of London which he described as "The hellish and dismal cloud of sea-coale," emanating from the establishments of "brewers, diers, lime burners, salt and sope-boilers" and other enterprises.

As a result, wrote Evelyn, "The city of London resembles the face rather of Mount Aetna, the Court of Vulcan, Stromboli, or the suburbs of hell than an assembly of rational creatures and the imperial seat of our incomparable monarch." Evelyn added that a person approaching London "sooner smells than sees the city to which he repairs."

The indignant Englishman held forth on the effects of this blight on people's health and appearance and upon growing things as well as the "hands and faces and linnen of our fair ladies and nicer dames."

Three centuries have gone by and matters have become worse than John Evelyn possibly could have foreseen.

They have become worse because in the United States and other industrialized countries the environment has not only been mastered by means of the industrial and technological revolutions but is being rapidly changed.

As Rachel Carson recently wrote: "It seems to me that air pollution should be viewed in the larger context to which it belongs. It is part of one of the most vital problems that confront mankind today: how to control the spreading contamination from many sources that is rapidly causing the deterioration of our environment. In biological history, no organism has survived long if its environment became in some way unfit for it. But no organism before man has deliberately polluted its own environment."

The air we breathe, like the land and the water that are the foundations of our life and work, has been altered. The very characteristics of a modern society—increasing population, industrial development, rising standards of living, advancing technology, mass transportation, great cities—have resulted in nearly 190 million Americans presently living at the bottom of a sea of air which is becoming burdened with an ever increasing amount and complex variety of polluting agencies.

It must be realized that air itself is a limited resource, like water or fossil fuels. Furthermore, only a small part of total air supply is available in any one place. Both as to quantity and quality, air must be considered and dealt with on sound conservation principles just as is done with other natural resources. This fact is particularly significant in view of the mass movement of people into the great metropolitan areas. Nearly one-half the total population is crowded into only 10 percent of the Nation's land area.

There are several similarities between air and water pollution, but also one major difference. Polluted water can be treated to purification processes and made fit for drinking. People must breathe the air, polluted or otherwise, as it comes to them. There is no opportunity for treatment to remove pollutants before the air is taken into the lungs unless everyone constantly wears a gas mask.

Like river systems, air moves with great disdain of local and State boundary lines, often carrying a burden of pollutants to cities, farms and forests. Since it is impossible to eliminate impurities already discharged into the atmosphere, the effort to control pollution must be aimed at the source—at preventing pollutants from being released in the first place.

Air never cleans itself. Particles are thrown off by gravity. Chemicals are changed by interactions among themselves. Ultimately, both chemicals and particles are washed away by rain.

How is the air polluted? Pollution comes from the burning of fuels in the home, in factories and in motor vehicles. It comes from chemicals released or used in mines and factories. It comes from the disposal of waste materials. It comes from the new processes developed by scientific research in creating new products. These factors interact and lead to a growth in other factors governing the kind and amount of pollutants released to the air.

The consequences of air pollution are now suffered throughout the Nation—in the cities and small towns, on the farms, and in the forests. It is truly a national problem.

Air is vital to the functioning of a modern society since the use of fuel depends on it. A ton of air occupies a volume of about 25,000 cubic feet. Motor vehicles burning about 60 billion gallons of fuel a year use 94 trillion cubic feet or 640 cubic miles of air. The combustion of a ton of coal requires about 27,000 pounds of air, the burning of a gallon of fuel oil takes 90 pounds of air and a pound of natural gas requires 18 pounds of air.

All told, about 3,000 cubic miles of air are necessary to meet the annual requirements for oxygen of all the fuels used in the United States alone. Other industrialized nations make equivalent demands—all of which contribute to a growing global problem.

Plant life using solar energy takes in carbon dioxide and converts it into oxygen. Man and other animals consume the oxygen, and in the process release carbon dioxide, the supply of which is augmented by burning fossil fuels. This causes an increase in the carbon dioxide content of the air, which is believed by many scientists to be causing a gradual warming of the earth's atmosphere with still unassessed modifications of climatic cycles.

Natural pollution is seldom significant in terms of the overall problem. It is man who has created the dilemma.

In the United States the quantity of pollutants thrown into the air is fantastic. Motor vehicles alone discharge each day: 250,000 tons of carbon monoxide, 16,500 to 33,000 tons of hydrocarbons and 4,000 to 12,000 tons of nitrogen oxides.

These releases, to use an illustration, can provide a concentration of carbon monoxide gas every day to contaminate the air as a concentration of 30 parts to 1 million of air to a 400-foot height over a 20,000-square-mile area, equivalent to the combined areas of Connecticut, Massachusetts, and New Jersey. According to air quality standards developed in California, 30 parts per million is termed "adverse" to the public health.

Concentration of particles of all known contaminants in the air measured by the U.S. Public Health Service between 1957 and

1961 would worsen this picture since it would include pollution released from metallurgical, chemical, and refining processes as well as from automotive combustion.

U.S. Public Health Service data show a variation between 63 micrograms of pollutants per cubic meter of air in communities of 10,000 to 25,000 population to 176 micrograms for cities over 3 million population. Thus it is clear that air pollution is directly related to the concentration of population.

In 1960, about 96 million people resided in 213 large communities covering an area of only 25,500 square miles. Put another way, 53 percent of the total U.S. population lives on less than 1 percent of the total land area. Many of these population concentrations are so clustered that air pollution from one cannot only affect another but extend such effects across State lines.

Smaller communities, as a rule, suffer from one or a relatively few sources of air pollution, usually affecting only their immediate areas. However, studies show major air pollution problems existed in 1960 in 308 urban places, an increase of 84 during the past 10 years and involving about 25 percent of the total U.S. population.

All in all, about 7,300 communities comprising 60 percent of the total U.S. population are facing one kind of air pollution problem or another.

The Surgeon General's 1962 Report on Motor Vehicles—Air Pollution and Health pointed out that more than 75 million motor vehicles of all kinds were registered in 1961, with an estimated 79 million for 1962. The report estimated that by 1977 there will be 113 million motor vehicles registered, a 43-percent increase within 5 years, together with an accompanying increase in discharges of hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide gas.

Wind speed and the height into the atmosphere to which pollutants from the earth's surface will mix limit the amount of pollutants capable of release without adverse results on human, animal, and plant life.

Fresh winds will disperse concentrations of noxious matter released from below, but winds are variable.

The atmospheric mixing depth under normal conditions is a product of the day-and-night cycle. In clear weather during daylight the sun warms the earth's surface and the air nearest to it. Warm air rises until it has cooled to the same temperature as the upper air and will then rise no further. This is the mixing depth.

During darkness, however, the earth's surface and adjacent air cools off until it is at a lower temperature than the upper air and a temperature inversion occurs. Heavier air close to the earth will not rise and there will be little mixing of any pollutants discharged into the atmosphere.

However, under normal conditions the morning sun will begin to break up the inversion of the previous night by warming the earth once again and recommencing the upward currents of warm air.

In summer, the mixing depth is higher, particularly in mountainous areas. In winter, with less heat from the sun, it is much lower, from 800 to 2,500 feet above ground level.

Sometimes these temperature inversions will persist over a large geographical area for a long time during periods of stagnant air movements associated with high barometric pressure weather conditions. Photochemical smog in the Los Angeles area is the most familiar example.

During such periods polluted air becomes more than a stealthy menace to human health, to the economy, and to recreational and esthetic values. It becomes in some instances a deadly killer.

In Donora, Penn., in October 1946, smog settled down in the valley for 3 days; 20 people died and 4,000 became acutely ill.

DYNAMIC ASSATEAGUE

In the 1962 word of the Maryland Board of Natural Resources, Assateague Island is "dynamic," which is to say that it is in motion and changing all the time as a result of the shifting effects of wind, waves, and currents. This summer the State, as represented by the department of forests and parks, is going to do something to help stabilize its own 2-mile fraction of the island. Hydraulic dredges will pump material out of the marshy bay side of the island and use it to build up a 12-foot dune line along the ocean side.

The protective dune line is preparatory to the first phase of the State's park development on Assateague, for which park officials are seeking \$1 million in their next capital budget. The first phase calls for roads and parking lots, a water supply and sewage disposal, underground electric and telephone lines, the leveling and stabilization (mostly with beach grass) of a camping area, toilets and a bathhouse and a superintendent's residence. With this much accomplished, the State will have a usable oceanfront park to go with the bridge which is scheduled to receive traffic at the close of the current summer season.

The State is thus working to uphold its end of the plans for State-Federal development of Assateague for public recreation. But its efforts to stabilize just 2 of the 24 miles of Assateague which lie in Maryland are not too promising, when portions of the island on either side of the State park remain "dynamic." What Maryland needs is Federal action: specifically, congressional action to acquire the rest of the island as a national seashore and thereby to assure that protective measures will be taken to stabilize the extensive stretches now in private hands. As the State begins its own work, it has every reason to step up its pressure on Congress to fulfill its part of what at the executive level is a Federal-State agreement.

U.S. AMBASSADOR TO SOUTH
VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a short time ago, we in the Senate learned that the U.S. Ambassador to South Vietnam, Ambassador Lodge, had resigned, and that the President of the United States had appointed, as Ambassador Lodge's successor, General Taylor, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. President, in the opinion of the senior Senator from Oregon, this has been a calamitous mistake on the part of the President of the United States. Furthermore, I believe this mistake shows very clearly the undue influence the Pentagon has come to exercise on the White House in the Johnson administration, in connection with U.S. foreign policy.

I believe it most unfortunate that a military officer, a general, who is Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and who has been recommending for many months past, an unsound foreign policy in South Vietnam—a policy which, as I said this morning to General Taylor and to Secretary of Defense McNamara, in their briefing before the Foreign Relations Committee, is leading us straight to a major war in Asia—has been appointed U.S. Ambassador to South Vietnam. It is a travesty that a military symbol is being appointed U.S. Ambassador to South Vietnam, an area of the world which, at the very moment I speak, is threatening the peace of the world.

Is there no civilian Democrat in a position of leadership whom the President of the United States can appoint civilian Ambassador of the United States to South Vietnam? Of course General Taylor will resign his military commission; but, so far as the rest of the world is concerned, the United States has appointed a general its Ambassador in the most troubled spot in the world today, threatening the peace of the world.

It is an inexcusable mistake, in my judgment, on the part of the President and I shall vote against the nomination when it comes to the Foreign Relations Committee and to the floor of the Senate.

NEVADA GOVERNOR ACCORDED
HIGH HONOR

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, contrary to popular impression, the 56th National Governors' Conference in Cleveland was not entirely a warmup for the Republican National Convention. Other events occurred during the session running from June 6 to June 10, including the election of Nevada's Gov. Grant Sawyer as chairman of the 1965 National Governors' Conference.

This is a signal honor for my State, Mr. President. Although Nevada is the fastest growing State in the Nation, it is still one of the smallest in population. Governor Sawyer's election, I believe, was a long overdue recognition of the relatively young Nevada chief executive's industry and ability and a salute to my State's growing importance. I can recall in the 1940's, when as Nevada attorney general, I was elected president of the National Association of Attorneys General, such national honors were rare indeed.

It is interesting to note, I think, that Governor Sawyer once worked in the Capitol here as an elevator operator—as did I—while studying law. Later, after service in the Armed Forces, the young lawyer was quick to launch a career in public service. In addition to being an active Democrat, he was a forceful and energetic district attorney in the Nevada ranching county of Elko. He was only 39 when, in 1958, he rose from district attorney to Governor in one dramatic leap. Governor Sawyer was elected to a second term in 1962 by an overwhelming majority.

An example of Governor Sawyer's initiative was in coauthorship with the Governors of Kentucky and Massachusetts of a civil rights statement introduced at the 1964 National Governors' Conference. This statement, supporting passage of the civil rights bill in Congress, was signed by 40 Governors participating in the National Conference.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a news story on Governor Sawyer's election as National Governor's Conference chairman carried in the Reno Evening Gazette of June 10, 1964.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Reno Evening Gazette, June 10, 1964]

NEVADAN ELECTED: SAWYER NEW GOVERNORS'
CHAIRMAN

CLEVELAND.—Gov. Grant Sawyer today was elected chairman of the 1965 National Governors' Conference, becoming the first Nevadan in history to win the position.

He was nominated without opposition following endorsements in the caucus of each party.

Other contenders for the post, which by procedure must be a Democrat next year, were Govs. John Dempsey of Connecticut, John Connally of Texas, Edmund Brown of California, Richard Hughes of New Jersey and George Wallace of Alabama.

Sawyer and Dempsey were the first and second choices, respectively, of the Democratic caucus late Tuesday and the names of both were submitted to the GOP caucus this morning.

Sawyer won there 12 to 3. With majority backing by both parties his nomination by a five-man committee was a formality.

The Nevada Governor did not campaign for the post. When approached by Democratic leaders early in the week, including a high representative of the National Democratic Committee, the Governor said he would accept the wish of the conference but "would not lift a finger" to win the nomination. Explaining his reluctance, he said the duties of the position would place a severe burden on his small office staff in Nevada.

Governor Sawyer also won backing for creation of a committee to help solve problems of election communication, creation of a committee for better Federal-State cooperation, a call for more stringent beef import quotas and more progressive public land laws and policies.

All Governors supported the suggestion for a committee on election laws and communications to work with newsmen "to explore ways and means of furthering the public interest in the handling and reporting of election results."

Sawyer said the committee should consider the responsibilities of the States on election laws and procedures as well as the overall responsibility of the news media in the handling of returns so that the public interest will best be served.

In his motion, Sawyer cited mutual concern of Governors and of newsmen on the matter of election victory statements before all polls have closed, handicaps imposed upon newsmen in the gathering of returns and antiquated election laws. "We have 'machined' ourselves into what could be a very serious problem—damaging to the prerogatives of a free electorate," he said.

"Flat pronouncements of victory based on early and fragmentary returns and before millions of Americans have cast their votes, have a definite effect on the electorate who have not voted and actually might influence an election."

He noted the danger would be especially acute in a presidential election, because of the time differential between east and west.

In his report as chairman of the committee on State planning, Sawyer said he felt the subject had been adequately covered and asked that the committee be dissolved and be replaced by an advisory committee on executive communication and coordination.

Its job will be to establish a mutually agreeable relationship and communications with the White House and executive agencies on development of federally aided projects in the individual States, Sawyer said.

Statements of policy on the cattle industry and development of natural resources, drafted by Sawyer and Gov. Clifford Hansen of Wyoming were signed by two-thirds of the State leaders.

More protection for the beef industry won support from 39 Governors while 35 chief executives joined in the call for full development of natural resources, including release of Federal lands for public and private development.

Charging that current levels of foreign livestock shipments to the United States are resulting in losses of millions of dollars to domestic producers, the beef statement urged a more realistic import quota base.

A congressional review of proposals for substantial changes in public land use, toward fewer restrictions to public land development, was the goal set by the Governors in the area of natural resources.

RELIEF OF SENECA INDIANS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement prepared by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] with relation to House bill 1794, for the relief of the Seneca Indians who will be displaced by the flooding of the Kinzua Dam on the Allegheny River in Pennsylvania and New York, which bill is still in conference.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SCOTT

I call to the Senate's attention the fact that we have as yet received no report from the conference committee on H.R. 1794, a bill for the relief of the Seneca Indians, who will be displaced by the flooding of the Kinzua Dam on the Allegheny River in Pennsylvania and New York. The committee has been hopelessly deadlocked over the House and Senate versions of the bill. Senate conferees have insisted upon the Senate version, which cut 64 percent of the funds for relief from the House-passed measure.

I note that the conference committee will meet tomorrow afternoon for the first time since May 12. I take this opportunity to deplore the impasse, and urge that the Senate conferees accept the House version, which provides \$20.15 million, a just sum for relocation of the Senecas, compensation for direct and indirect damages the Indian nation will incur, as well as vital rehabilitation of the Senecas.

Our obligation to the Seneca nation is embodied in one of our oldest and most important treaties, based upon a personal promise to the Senecas by George Washington in 1794.

Unless prompt action is taken, the Senecas of the Allegheny Reservation will find themselves underway in the spring of 1965. The Senecas must have sufficient time to reestablish themselves elsewhere before the project is completed.

If the conference committee does not resolve the problem this week, I urge the Senate to consider taking action similar to that called for in H.R. 11601, introduced in the House last week by Representative ABLE of Ohio. Representative ABLE's bill would have the effect of prohibiting the flooding of the Kinzua Dam until a suitable provision for relocation of the Indians has been instituted.

WINNING ESSAYS IN 1964 McGEE SENATE INTERNSHIP CONTEST

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, in order that the Members of this body may share with me the excellence of thought and the depth of understanding shown by the Wyoming young people who were

honorable mention winners in the 1964 McGee Senate Internship Contest, I ask unanimous consent that two of these essays—by James Helzer, of Cheyenne, and Sandra Rae Clark, of Sheridan—be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAKING DEMOCRACY WORK BETTER (By James Albert Helzer)

To understand ways to make democracy work better, we must first of all comprehend the concept of American democracy. We traditionally associate the word "democracy" with popular sovereignty, a doctrine which holds that the citizens of the country are the basis of all political authority. Democracy in our republican America has two distinct aspects. On the one hand, it emphasizes the natural rights of the individual, the limited government, the rule of law, and civil liberties. On the other hand, it portrays a people striving to make social equality a premise of government. When combined, these two aspects become American government. From this we can readily see that American democracy is nothing less than the belief in individual freedom founded upon laws supported by a government of the whole people, by the whole people, in which the majority prevails.

Thus we perceive that the individual is as important to the overall welfare of his country as is the country's welfare to himself. The overall effectiveness in a democracy therefore hinges upon the way in which the respective citizens exercise their powers either in person or through representatives. There has been a failure, nonetheless, by a majority to meet the challenge of individual participation, the prime requirement which citizens of a democratic republic must recognize. An examination in somewhat closer detail dealing with the relation of citizen to state is therefore in order.

Every American citizen has a voice in the policy, which at least occasionally calls upon him to take part in the government by discharging specific services which benefit the people. Yet when the call is sent forth, the majority of the citizenry, which undoubtedly numbers many potential leaders in its ranks, does not respond. The two basic problems of democracies such as ours are spelled out by this single problem. There is the persistent question of good leadership at all levels of government and of the need for securing the political services offered by the best qualified men while still not infringing upon the rights of all men. These services are not all glamor, as that of a Governor or Senator might be, but rather fall in the category of the offices of county chairman, of precinct chairman, to name just two. The latter offices, while lacking in the eminence of the former ones, are just as necessary to the machinery of government, for they as the smaller cogs allow the big cogs to work.

The form of government, a democratic-republic, and the size of the nation magnify manifold these problems of leadership. From the definition originally given democracy, it is not difficult to see that the more who participate the better the governmental operation. It is for this key reason that no justification for a lack of participation can be found, especially if there is a desire to continue the present form of government and to improve it. It is natural at this point to take an additional step and stress that in the United States no one man has any more intrinsic right to hold office than another. Granted now, people must realize that numerous obligations go hand in hand with this right and that these obligations center on a sense of being well informed. Some persons more readily qualify to fill certain responsible positions than do others,

but reasonably intelligent men may and should through study qualify themselves for governmental participation.

Concurrently with the leadership problem, there is the issue of the character of rule which may be exercised. Organization of will, essential to effective democratic action, is extremely vulnerable to the pressures of minority groups such as lobbies. The gravity of the situation is even further amplified when the rule is tyrannically exercised by a majority over a minority. It is all important to have all citizens involved.

By placing the two essential problems side by side, we are now able to visualize the twofold responsibility each of us faces: Regardless of race, creed, color, or sex, we must be willing to attempt to lead; but more than this, we must be willing to participate in the cooperative effort influenced only by the qualities of true statesmanship.

Since able participation can never be founded either upon such things as ignorance and bigotry or incited through mob hysteria and selfish interest, participation must have its keystone in a liberal education which fits each citizen for a life of political freedom and selfless concern. In short, the members of the body politic owe it to society to be educated not only while young and in school but also while adults. The overall requirement is clearly one of a broad education dealing with impartial analysis of different views regarding various topics. The direct derivative of such education is the needed sharing in government at every level. The Nation, furthermore, will benefit as there will not be a lack of men able to weigh fairly various interests and views, many not their own, for they will be guided by a background in cases of conflicting claims, platforms, ideas, and the like. Clearly, the Government which calls all to citizenship also calls for the full power of education behind it.

The stimulus thus applied to the adult builds him into an intelligent coworker in the constructive effort of our democratic institutions. The basic problems of the Government are thereby resolved. The leadership question is relieved as more knowledgeable people attempt to lead and are more able to participate with rational "coolheadedness" in functional aspects of government, including the selection of those capable of being representatives of the people at the various governmental levels. We can see that such education and a method of selection for leaders is a necessity, as we realize that the purpose of representatives is to enlarge and refine the public opinion by discerning the true best interests of the populace.

The second problem is resolved simultaneously with the first as the greater participation of all citizens makes it impossible to have either a dominant minority or tyrannical majority.

Essentially, the problem of making democracy work better falls upon the liberally educated citizen who participates in government. The better the education and the larger the number of citizens participating—inevitably, the better the democracy.

MAKING DEMOCRACY WORK BETTER (By Sandra Clark)

One of the foremost inventions of all times is a giant machine called democracy. First discovered by the Greeks, it was later enlarged by the Romans to serve a growing population. Some 180 years ago it was again improved, and since that time it has been used as the means of governing one of the greatest nations on earth, the United States of America. Like any other machine, however, democracy can be thrown out of gear by a single loose bolt or one missing screw. At a time when external forces threaten to destroy this machine it is particularly important that all of its working

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

ence, as printed in the subcommittee hearings, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPECIAL DONABLE PROPERTY SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,

Washington, D.C., July 9, 1962.

Hon. IVAN NESTINGEN,
Under Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has come to my attention that the Symington subcommittee on the stockpile is considering the introduction of a bill which would permit the use of surplus stockpile materials in AID programs and also for Federal use. It is my understanding that many of the materials, especially metals, in the stockpile could well be used in certain of our educational institutions for various purposes.

The legal opinion from GSA is to the effect that surplus stockpile material is not donable under the provisions of section 203 (j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act. I would therefore appreciate your views as to whether or not it would be worthwhile to propose legislation

to make some of the surplus stockpile material available for educational purposes.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Chairman, Special
Subcommittee on Donable Property.

DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, July 26, 1962.

Hon. JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on Donable Property, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MONAGAN: On July 13 we replied to your letter of July 9 concerning the use of surplus stockpile materials as donable surplus property.

We have reviewed the situation with educational authorities to ascertain which items could be effectively utilized by schools, colleges, and universities. This review shows that selected materials could be used in instructional programs at different levels. Others might be used in special research and development activities in colleges and universities; still others might be used in the general plant maintenance and operation programs of schools and colleges. The table which follows gives illustrative examples of some of these materials and the potential uses for them in these areas.

Strategic material	Potential uses in—			
	Instructional program		Research program, colleges and universities	Plant operation and maintenance program
	Elementary and secondary schools	Colleges and universities		
Asbestos.....	X	X	X	X
Copper.....	X	X	X	X
Corundum.....	X	X	X	X
Diamond dies.....	X	X	X	X
Feathers and down.....	X	X	X	X
Graphite.....	X	X	X	X
Iodine.....	X	X	X	X
Manganese dioxide.....	X	X	X	X
Mercury.....	X	X	X	X
Pyrethrum.....	X	X	X	X
Ruby.....	X	X	X	X
Selenium.....	X	X	X	X
Shellac.....	X	X	X	X

Some illustrative examples of specific usages of these materials in the four areas are outlined below.

1. Laboratory instruction:

Mercury: Used in chemistry and physics laboratories for a number of purposes, such as the measurement of low atmospheric pressures, chemical reactions, and various laboratory instruments.

Quartz crystals: Used in physics laboratories for the generation and detection of high frequency and electromagnetic radiation.

2. Shop training:

Diamond dies: Useful in numerous types of grinding and cutting operations.

Shellac: Not only used in plant operation and maintenance (separate category above), but also in shop training (cabinets, boats, models, etc.).

3. Research:

Ruby: Basic ingredient in very new development of ruby masers which are extremely powerful beams of light, the numerous applications of which are still the subject of much research.

Selenium: One of elements used in doping crystals of germanium and silicon for producing semiconductors. These form basis of all types of transistors and junction devices.

4. Operation and maintenance of plants:

Feathers: A natural product, probably requiring no further processing, which should be useful to any institution responsible for housing programs.

5. Operation of hospitals and clinics:

Iodine: Useful not only in chemistry laboratory instruction (separate category above), but also, in more refined form, in hospital treatment of wounds, etc.

The extent to which these materials could be used and the amounts which might be required cannot be predicted at this time for several reasons:

(a) The degree of refinement of the stockpile materials is not clearly indicated in the report available to us, making it difficult to determine if a particular material would be usable in the form in which it would be made available to the schools and colleges;

(b) Instructional programs, curriculums, and teaching methods of schools and colleges are undergoing extensive revisions at the present time; and

(c) Many of the research and development programs of colleges and universities are restricted or classified. Information on needed materials is available only from the directors of these activities. (This will take time.)

Since more specific information on the types and quantities of strategic materials which could be used by schools and colleges is advisable, we will continue our inquiries. However, on the basis of the information available, it is apparent that many of the items in the stockpile are needed in health and educational programs. We would suggest that they be made available for donation to eligible health and educational donees on the same basis as provided in pres-

ent programs for other Federal surplus property.

Sincerely yours,

IVAN A. NESTINGEN,
Under Secretary.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, material in the stockpile is being sought by educational institutions. Mercury is an example.

Last year, it appeared for a time that 52,000 flasks of mercury, each weighing some 76 pounds, and acquired at a total cost of more than \$12.2 million, might be excess to need, and might be available under the donable surplus property program. Before it was finally decided to place that mercury in the stockpile, colleges and universities in 35 States had applied for more than the total amount available.

Mr. President, adoption of my amendment would be in the public interest in education and health, in industry, and economic development. Public property, bought with public funds to meet a public need, is worth much more to public institutions than it is to junk dealers. The donable surplus property program has provided our hard-pressed schools and hospitals with land and equipment they could not have afforded. It has helped to educate our youngsters and to care for the sick and injured. Modification of surplus equipment for classroom use has challenged the students, and also the teachers, who thereby also were instructed. The program has stimulated research in the national interest. In many cases, research has led to production contracts, profitable to the school and the surrounding business community. The program has created new markets—for experience has shown that a research program, begun with donated material, does not end when that material is gone. Rather, the institution goes into the open market and buys new material. The donable surplus property program has been an outstanding success. It should be extended to include material in the stockpile found to be surplus to present need.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE WAR IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall not speak at great length.

Whenever I listen to a Member of the Senate attempt to rationalize the U.S. outlawry in southeast Asia, I propose to register my dissent.

Mr. President, as I said earlier, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] made a historic speech this afternoon on the United Nations. It was a speech that needed to be made.

I am sorry that he marred his speech at the end in his colloquy with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, for, if I understood him correctly, he underwrote as a present policy the making of war in southeast Asia by the United States.

Mr. President, I not only disagree with that part of the speech of the Senator from Idaho, which was supported by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], with whom I also disagree, but I thor-

oughly disagree with the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], on whose committee I have the privilege of serving. In my judgment the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee talked in terms of myths, although he seems to be against myths in American foreign policy. How in the world the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee thinks that we can continue to violate one obligation after another under the U.N. Charter and violate our obligations under the Geneva accords, and preserve the United Nations as a force for keeping peace in the world, I am at a loss to understand. How the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee can think that the United States can make war in southeast Asia in violation of our international law obligations and expect the United Nations to survive, I am at a loss to understand.

I wish to recapitulate these points very quickly for the Record, for under articles XXXIII, XXXVII, and XLI of the United Nations Charter, as I have pointed out in a series of speeches on international obligations on the floor of the Senate for the last several weeks, the United States has the clear treaty duty to take the southeast Asia crisis to the United Nations. Instead we have walked out on the United Nations. By walking out on the United Nations, by committing acts of war, the United States will go down in history as a country that helped scuttle the United Nations, unless we proceed without further delay to rebuild the United Nations. The United Nations is much weaker today than it was 90 days ago. It is much weaker today than it was 90 days ago because of the United States. I am at a loss to understand why we have played into the hands of the Communists. I am at a loss to understand why we have walked out on our professed ideals about wishing to substitute the rule of law for the jungle law of military force. It is still a jungle law of military force when it is the U.S. military force as much as in the case of Red China, Red Russia, or any other power in the world.

We started to pave the way for the inexcusable position in which the United States is now occupying itself in world affairs when John Foster Dulles, back in 1954, decided not to sign the first Geneva accord, and then persuaded South Vietnam not to sign it. Then the United States set up its protectorate in South Vietnam. The United States set up its puppet government in South Vietnam. Do we think that the world does not know it? We are in no better position in South Vietnam than Red Russia is in East Germany. We have no more right to follow the course of action we are following in South Vietnam than Red Russia has to follow the course of action she is following in East Germany. We are making war. We profess to be seeking peace.

I was shocked to hear the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who made a speech not so long ago on foreign policy myths, propound the great myth that the United States stands for peace,

and in order to preserve it, we are going to make war. That is pure nonsense.

Mr. President, John Foster Dulles also created a paper tiger known as SEATO. It is pretty well so recognized now. Sulzberger, the editor of the New York Times, wrote in a column not so long ago—and I used it in argument previously here on the floor of the Senate—that in a conference he had with John Foster Dulles, one of the reasons assigned for our taking the course of action we took in regard to SEATO was to give us what John Foster Dulles thought would be a legal right to follow the course of action that we followed in South Vietnam.

But, of course, it did not give us that legal right. If the United States were taken before the World Court on any phase of this problem, I am satisfied that we would lose a unanimous decision, because we are dead wrong.

Mr. President, who created the paper tiger known as the SEATO, and who persuaded Australia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Thailand, the Philippines, France, and Great Britain to sign it? It is the brainchild of John Foster Dulles. That treaty created what is known in international law as a protocol agreement. That is what our administration is constantly relying upon. Not so long ago the President said that he felt all the legal authority he needed—I paraphrase him, but accurately—was the SEATO treaty. The SEATO treaty does not give Lyndon B. Johnson one iota of right to make war in South Vietnam in the absence of a declaration of war. The President of the United States is violating the Constitution every hour that he proceeds to make war in South Vietnam. The Constitution does not give the President of the United States the power to make war. That power happens to be vested in the Congress of the United States. But I say most respectfully, but critically that too many of my colleagues are ducking, weaving, and hedging on this problem.

They are not facing their responsibilities, born of the oath that they took when they came into this body. We are making war in South Vietnam, and we are making it unconstitutionally. We are killing American boys illegally. The number that we have killed thus far is a small number compared with the tens of thousands that we shall kill if we do not stop this administration's course of action in southeast Asia.

The American people apparently will have choices between degrees next November. They will have the choice between a slower-paced Democratic war and a faster-paced Republican war.

Mr. President, it is a sad thing that we have not officially called for a SEATO meeting and put it up to our alleged allies who have welshed on us in regard to the protocol agreement involving South Vietnam.

One of the saddest things is the constant reference by the leaders of this Government to the fact that North Vietnam, Laos, and Red China are violating the Geneva accords; and so they are. They ought to be held to an accounting. They ought not to be held to an accounting on the basis of a unilateral military action by the United States setting itself

up as the policeman of the world to enforce the Geneva accords, particularly when we have already been found guilty of violating the Geneva accords ourselves. For the Geneva accords set up a so-called neutral commission to police them and to point out to the world their violations. The interesting thing is that that neutral commission found North Vietnam a violator of the Geneva accords and South Vietnam a violator of the Geneva accords. The basis on which it found South Vietnam a violator of the Geneva accords was its accepting American military assistance and American military personnel in violation of the prohibitions of the Geneva accords.

That is why I am charging my Government, with sadness, of being in violation of international law in South Vietnam. It is not pleasant to make that charge, but I think there is still a fighting chance of preserving the peace, and we do not support the best interests of our country by supporting this administration's program in South Vietnam.

An interesting statement was made by the majority whip [Mr. HUMPHREY], and I told him I would answer him. He said he is against the escalation of war in southeast Asia, and he is satisfied the administration is against it, too. He could not be more wrong, for the program of this administration is headed toward the escalation of war in southeast Asia, and we have already done it to a serious degree.

Under article IV of the Geneva accord, we had no right to drop a single bomb on Laos. But we did. It was an act of war. It would be found to be an act of war by any international juridical tribunal that tried us. We would be found guilty.

This country has violated the borders of Cambodia. I have been advised by military personnel that we have also found it convenient, by accident, so-called, to violate the borders of North Vietnam.

Mr. President, the blueprint exists to escalate the war unless southeast Asia does the United States' bidding.

I am also interested in the talk we have heard about our having no ambition or desire for a square inch of territory; that we seek no colony. But back of it, Mr. President, is a determination for economic and military control of southeast Asia.

Before the week is over, or in the first part of next week, I expect to make a speech that I am now preparing, based upon research, as to the economic objectives and the economic operations of the United States in southeast Asia. The facts about our economic plans pierce the balloon about the motives of the United States in southeast Asia.

Mr. President, we are scuttling the United Nations by this course of action. I do not know how in the world we think we can have much influence against Russia in the future as she violates treaties by pleading that the United Nations exercise jurisdiction against Russia's violations of international law. What we ought to do is backtrack now.

I have never proposed, and I do not propose tonight, that the United States

pull up stakes and get out of South Vietnam. But there is all the difference in the world between a program that seeks to make peace and a program that seeks to make war.

As the Senator from Idaho pointed out, the Vietcong are supposed to have some 25,000 members. The Government of South Vietnam has at least 400,000 troops. South Vietnam has 15 million people. If there is a situation in South Vietnam in which 400,000 South Vietnamese troops and more than \$5½ billion of American military aid to South Vietnam cannot control 25,000 Vietcong, we cannot possibly hope to win over there by pouring in American blood.

I do not propose to let the administration or the American people forget that France sacrificed 240,000 French boys in the Indonesian war, and we poured in \$1½ billion to help France conduct that war. Finally, the French people pulled down the French Government and said they had had enough.

We are going to lose if we get bogged down in a major war in Asia, and we are headed toward such a war with hundreds of thousands of American boys involved.

But, as the Senator from Idaho raised the question, when we get through with the military victory, what then? What will we have won? No war ever produced peace. When are we going to learn that sad lesson? We are going to be forced to use nuclear weapons if we get into a major war in that area, and thereby earn, deservedly, the hatred of mankind for decades and decades to come.

What are we going to do after we get a military victory? In my judgment, it is the best assurance for a bankrupt American nation, for we will not only be bled white in terms of blood, but we will be bled white in terms of financial resources.

We ought to stop thinking we can set ourselves up as the enforcement officer of the world and police it. We do not have the manpower, to begin with. Neither does the United States have the financial resources.

I close with the last topic. I completely disagree with the majority whip [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the other Senators who bespoke in favor of the appointment of General Taylor as Ambassador to Saigon.

I want the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] to take note that General Taylor is not a George Marshall. General Taylor is not a Bradley. He is not even in their class. General Taylor is the one who, not so many years ago, urged the use of nuclear weapons if we got into trouble with Russia over Berlin—which means he was ready to start a nuclear war. General Taylor has been one of the architects, along with McNamara, of McNamara's war in South Vietnam. General Taylor has been one of those who has been following a course of action which, as I said in his presence this morning, and in that of the Secretary of Defense also, will lead us straight into a major war with Asia if the program is not stopped.

As I said earlier this afternoon, I cannot think of a greater mistake for Presi-

dent Johnson to make than to appoint a general who has been one of the war-making architects in South Vietnam as our Ambassador to South Vietnam.

We have an indication of what is going to happen already. We see which way the wind is blowing. His nomination will be confirmed in the Senate. But it will not be confirmed with the vote of the senior Senator from Oregon.

A great civilian Democrat should have been appointed Ambassador to South Vietnam, demonstrating to the world that, after all, this country, in the field of foreign policy, is run by civilians, and not by the Pentagon Building.

For months now the Pentagon has functioned as Secretary of State, and Dean Rusk has functioned as the Pentagon's flunkie. For months American foreign policy in South Vietnam and in southeast Asia has been determined by the Pentagon Building, and not by the State Department. It happens to be an ugly fact, but I believe it to be true. I am aghast at the fact that we are now representing to the world that we had to resort to the appointment of a military man as Ambassador in that troubled spot of the world, where, more than anywhere else, the peace of the globe is threatened.

All one has to do is read the news releases of the last couple of days to see how far we have gone in American foreign policy by way of military intervention. Admiral Felt made a statement in Taipei that the United States will risk a war with Red China if Red China interferes with this country's policy in southeast Asia. He should have had his uniform stripped from him immediately.

Under our form of government, we should not be permitting top military brass to make announcements to the world about what our foreign policy will be. That was a statement which should have been made by the Secretary of State, first being approved by the President, or by the President himself.

Then General Harkins came back from southeast Asia and was quoted by the New York Times as making a similar statement.

I say that General Harkins was completely out of character. His job as a military officer is to carry out military orders, not to determine foreign policy.

Mr. President, here is one voice that will continue to be raised in opposition to the warmaking foreign policy of the United States. My office is being flooded—I do not know how many hundreds of communications we have received today—with communications in opposition to the policy of this administration, and in support of the position that the senior Senator from Oregon is taking in opposition to our outlawry in southeast Asia.

As I have said before, if a declaration of war is passed, then the senior Senator from Oregon will of course rally behind that declaration until the war is won, at whatever cost. But so long as there is a chance to avoid that war by seeking to persuade the people of our country and the Government of this country to change its direction from that of marching into a great holocaust and killing

hundreds of thousands of our boys unjustifiably and needlessly, I shall continue to do what I can to plead for peace.

I suggest that if we really mean all the things that have been said this afternoon about the United Nations, then we ought to start supporting the United Nations. I say to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee that he ought to be supporting the position that some of us have taken now for many weeks, asking that the United States lay the crisis before the Security Council. And if it is vetoed by Red Russia, which I think it probably would be, then we should call for an extraordinary session of the General Assembly of the United Nations and let the other nations of the world join in passing on what course of action ought to be followed in South Vietnam.

Mr. President, I am very sorry to find myself, as a Democrat, unalterably opposed to the position of my President in South Vietnam. But I think history will record that his position has been a mistaken one. I shall continue to hope that he will change his course of action by returning our foreign policy to the framework of international law. We should proceed to lay this Asian crisis before the United Nations. If the United Nations has the potentialities that the senior Senator from Idaho bespoke of this afternoon, then the United States ought to start using it and stop scuttling it.

Mr. President, I am ready to yield the floor. But, in accordance with an understanding previously reached to the effect that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] had a matter to bring up, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATOR RANDOLPH SPEAKS AT DEDICATION OF THEODORE ROOSEVELT BRIDGE—DELIVERS ELOQUENT TRIBUTE TO PRESIDENT IT MEMORIALIZES

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, earlier today our colleague, Senator RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, delivered the dedication address for the ceremony opening the Theodore Roosevelt Bridge. This structure serves as a memorial to a great President, who, as Senator RANDOLPH said, "gave to us a rich heritage and a rewarding hope as we work together in the building of a better America."

The event, sponsored by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Department of Highways, and the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, was attended by several hundred people. Included were members of the Roosevelt family.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks, the items on the official program,

14304

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 23, 1964

and the eloquent address of Senator RANDOLPH.

There being no objection, the program and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRAM

Master of ceremonies: Brig. Gen. C. M. Duke, Engineer Commissioner, District of Columbia.

Music by the U.S. Navy Band, Lt. Comdr. Anthony A. Mitchell, leader.

Armed Forces Joint Color Team.

National anthem.

Invocation: Rev. Robert W. Olewiler, Grace Reformed Church.

Greetings by master of ceremonies.

Introduction of distinguished guests.

"John F. Kennedy Center March." Lt. Comdr. Anthony A. Mitchell, U.S. Navy Band.

Remarks: The Honorable Jennings Randolph, U.S. Senate.

Unveiling of plaque.

Ribbon cutting.

Motorcade will form and proceed west across bridge.

REMARKS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, OF WEST VIRGINIA, CHAIRMAN, SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ROADS, FORMER CHAIRMAN, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND FORMER MEMBER, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ROADS, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE THEODORE ROOSEVELT BRIDGE JUNE 23, 1964

Honored guests, ladies, and gentlemen, the moment has arrived. After 14 years the bridge is a reality. Convenience and necessity are well served by this structure which provides another vital link in our Interstate Highway System.

This bridge is an enduring memorial to the labors and the patience of those who have been involved since it was first authorized by Congress 10 years ago this August. Despite the scepticism and perhaps even despair which was occasionally experienced by some of its planners, the bridge is testimony that government by committee can work. For many committees and commissions as well as a President and the Congress, have had their hands in this effort. The democratic process of consultation and compromise has finally been brought to fruition. This structure is a tribute not only to the skills that have created it, but also to the skills of persons who reconciled the many interests involved.

It is another merited memorial to the President in whose memory it is dedicated. This bridge and the Interstate System of which it is a part, are products of the needs and the technology of America in the 20th century. And President Theodore Roosevelt, whose White House years ushered in the 20th century, was the first President to lead America in its role as a world power. With his mediation of the Russo-Japanese dispute, his involvement in the dispute over Algeria

by the great European powers, and his dispatch of the Great White Fleet on its world cruise, Teddy Roosevelt was the first President to reject the traditional American attitude of nonentanglement in the affairs of the Old World. He spoke to the other powers in clear terms, serving notice that the United States had come of age and was a power to be reckoned with by all nations.

In two other major areas Theodore Roosevelt was the first President to grapple with the 20th-century problems of America. He saw clearly that the vast concentrations of wealth and power in the modern corporation exceeded in some instances the power of the individual States and rivaled that of the United States and in some instances was not in national interest. He recognized the threat and acted on it. But he also recognized the inevitability of corporate growth, was not hypnotized by the curse of bigness, and was concerned only that the corporations not outgrow the law and the people they were designed to serve. His action in bringing government suit against the railroad combine of the Northern Securities Co. launched the Federal Government in its role of effective regulation of monopolies. This was a role created under the administration of one Roosevelt and extended under that of another.

But it is for his contribution to the conservation of our natural resources that most of us honor the name and memory of Teddy Roosevelt. As a rancher, as a hunter, as an explorer, and as a historian Theodore Roosevelt acquired a deep and lasting appreciation for the generosity of nature and the scenic grandeur of the American West. Yet, he was a prophet of the 20th century in recognizing as did few of his contemporaries and none of his predecessors in the White House that the natural resources of America are not inexhaustible.

With his immense talent for life and his exuberant love of nature, Teddy Roosevelt acknowledged the responsibility of his generation—and of the Federal Government—to protect and conserve America's resources for the oncoming generations. As Robert M. La Follette wrote:

"When the historian * * * shall speak of Theodore Roosevelt, he is likely to say that he did many notable things, but that his greatest work was inspiring and actually beginning a world movement for staying territorial waste and saving for the human race the things on which alone a peaceful, progressive, and happy life can be founded."

Roosevelt urged in 1901 the creation of a national forest in my own area of Appalachia. And during his two administrations he proclaimed 5 national parks, 16 national monuments, 51 wildlife refuges, and 21 national forest reserves. One can say in accuracy that with these Executive actions and the professionalization of the U.S. Forest Service which he sponsored under Gifford Pinchot, President Theodore Roosevelt created our

national forest system and the modern conservation movement. His convictions were best expressed in his own terms when laying the cornerstone of the gateway to Yellowstone Park in 1903: "I cannot too often repeat," he stated, "that the essential feature in the present management of the Yellowstone Park, as in all similar places, is its essential democracy. * * * It is the preservation of the scenery, of the forests, of the wilderness life and the wilderness game for the people as a whole, instead of leaving the enjoyment thereof to be confined to the very rich who can control private reserves."

Roosevelt's achievements in conservation of our forest resources were equaled if not exceeded by his contribution to the wise use and development of our waterways.

In his letter to the chairman of the Inland Waterway Commission, which body he created in 1907, he wrote that "works designed to control our waterways have * * * been undertaken for a single purpose, such as the improvement of navigation, development of power, the irrigation of arid lands, or the protection of lowlands from floods. * * * While the rights of the people to these and similar uses of water must be respected, the time has come for merging local projects and uses of the inland waters in a comprehensive plan designed for the benefit of the whole country."

This was the beginning of comprehensive water resource planning in America. And President Roosevelt's principles that "every stream is a unit from its source to its mouth, and that all its uses are interdependent" have become the guiding principles of water resource planning.

It is fitting that such a man and such a President be memorialized by this island refuge in the midst of the metropolitan area of our Capital City and by the bridge which offers a vista of the island. Here are woven together the two threads of his interest and initiative in the conservation of land and water.

It was said of Theodore Roosevelt by a visiting British writer that "Roosevelt is not an American, you know. He is America." In this sense, in honoring a great man and a great President, we honor ourselves as we dedicate the Theodore Roosevelt Bridge. He gave to us a rich heritage and a rewarding hope—as we work together in the building of a better America.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 24, 1964, at 12 o'clock meridian.

June 23

denied this fundamental right of all Americans. Our son and these students are fighting for ideals of American liberty and justice. To avoid threatened violence we ask you to provide necessary means to prevent a serious incident. The only source of protection is the Federal Government. It would be tragic should our Government fail them.

Mr. and Mrs. O. EDWARD CANTOR.

TENAFLY, N.J. June 5, 1964.

Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: I am 19 years old, the son of two of your constituents. I have followed with joy and amazement the work you have been trying to do for America's migrant labor, one of the most downtrodden and voteless groups in America. I am calling for your help now both for myself and for another downtrodden and voteless group, the Mississippi Negroes. Attempts to register Negroes in Mississippi in the past few years have met with universal and stubborn resistance. This resistance has often taken the ugly form of violence, on the part of both the white citizenry and the Mississippi police. There have been at least five racial murders in the State within the last few months.

I am a summer volunteer for the voter registration drive sponsored by the Council of Federated Organizations in Mississippi as a part of their Mississippi summer project. I know what has happened to those who have worked in the field before me. I also know the record of the executive branch of the Federal Government; its silences and refusals to protect the constitutional rights of Americans working for freedom, not in the steaming jungles of Vietnam but in the steaming cauldron of hatred that is Mississippi. Your vote for the civil rights bill is part of an important first step in the realization of the American dream. As a man with the integrity and responsibility of a U.S. Senator, you can use the forum of the U.S. Senate to challenge the record of the Justice Department and to confront those Mississippi Senators who share your senatorial and party title—but little else—with the actions of their State against freedom.

I hope that as my Senator you will speak out for me should my rights as an American be abridged. I hope that you will not hear from me this summer as an inmate of a Mississippi jail or hospital. If you do, I believe enough in your honesty and sense of justice to expect to hear your voice in the Senate on behalf of freedom.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID W. TRIMBLE.

TEANECK, N.J. June 17, 1964.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to enlist your help in a matter of great concern.

I am referring to the very real threat to the lives of the students participating in the Mississippi project of the Student Non-violent Coordinating Commission.

My son, Leigh, age 20, has just completed his junior year at New York University, University Heights, N.Y., where he volunteered for the project. He is at present at Western Women's College in Oxford, Ohio, for a 1-week orientation period. From there the group will proceed to Jackson, Miss. to help in a voter registration educational program.

I would like to draw your attention to an article which appeared in the Record (Hackensack, N.J.) on Monday, June 15 (p. 5) which plainly states the seriousness of the matter.

I am asking you to do what you can to provide safe conduct to these young men and women by bringing to bear the influence of

your office. This much is owed to those who have enlisted in a cause to secure the future of our country.

Very truly yours,

ELSIE R. STELZER
Mrs. E. N. Stelzer.

PLAINFIELD, N.J., June 22, 1964.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for supporting wonderful young participants Mississippi summer project. Your comparison with Peace Corps is apt. Our daughter Barbara, now in Ohio, enters Mississippi Thursday. Do you know three workers, including one volunteer, are reported missing State patrol are involved. Please continue to press for Federal protection.

MARGARET and GEORGE MUTNICK.

RUTHERFORD, N.J., June 23, 1964.

Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Shocked by report three student volunteers in registration drive missing for 48 hours in Mississippi after arrest and bail. Request immediate investigation and need for legislative machinery.

ELIZABETH WENK.

RUTHERFORD, N.J., June 23, 1964.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Three college students engaged in voter registration education disappeared this weekend. One, Andy Goodman, is a close friend. They were last seen 1 hour after leaving jail in Mississippi on bond, charged with speeding. I fear for their lives. Please inquire at the Justice Department about this matter.

RONALD FINSTON.

JERSEY CITY, N.J., June 23, 1964.

Congressman HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

My own experience in Hattiesburg makes me amazed that the 11 p.m. news should say FBI only now "considering" helping locate missing peaceful workers for Federal rights in Meridian. Our experience with trumped-up traffic arrests and our own group having to surround man seeking to present self to FBI makes danger of foul play seem more than obvious. With respect urge Federal action be increased markedly in such cases.

Best wishes sincerely,

Rev. DUDLEY E. SARFATY.

NEW YORK, N.Y., June 23, 1964.

Hon. HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to press for immediate full-scale investigation of the shocking disappearance of three young fighters for civil rights.

ISAAC PATCH, JR.

ROSELLE, N.J., June 18, 1964.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: In 2 days I will be leaving to teach in a freedom school in the State of Mississippi. The exact location I do not know yet. My primary purpose in being in Mississippi is to teach remedial skills to Negro students in the 11th and 12th grades. I am very much aware of the physical dangers I will encounter this summer. This is the reason I am writing to you. I ask, of you, as my elected representative in the U.S. Government, for protection to act in my trained profession, that of a teacher. I implore you to do everything in your power to see that no physical

harm comes to me as a result of my teaching, reading, 'riting, and 'rithmetic.

Thanking you, I am,

MARY L. GILLARD.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, those who supported legislation to guarantee civil rights in voting in 1957, in 1960, and again last week cannot be indifferent to the fate of individuals who attempt to put the dry words of the law into practice. I hope the attention of the Senate and the American people can be focused on the situation in Mississippi. Above all, I hope that the people of Mississippi accept the great responsibility which is theirs, to see that law and order prevail.

A FOREIGN POLICY IMPERATIVE: UNSWERVING AMERICAN SUPPORT FOR THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, we are about to mark the 20th anniversary of the founding of the United Nations. It is a fitting time to review the history, assess the health, and measure the hardness of this extraordinary experiment. For if there is one thing which we can say for sure about the U.N., it is that the organization markedly differs from what was contemplated by its founders two decades ago.

1. ORIGINAL CONCEPTION OF U.N.

Originally, at San Francisco in 1945, we constructed the United Nations upon the great alliance which was winning the Second World War. In the mistaken belief that the victors, united in war by a common enemy, would remain united afterward, we entrusted the primary responsibility for peacekeeping, not to the General Assembly, where all countries were to be equally represented, but to the Security Council, where the Big Five would have permanent seats, each equipped with a built-in veto. Our vision was of a pax victorum, where peace would be maintained by the United States, the United Kingdom, France, China, and the Soviet Union, acting in concert through the Security Council. The veto was to guarantee that no policeman's club would be raised to enforce the peace, except by the common consent of the Big Five.

To be candid, the United Nations Charter was carefully drawn to permit the Big Five, after having obtained the required number of votes, to impose their will upon other countries threatening to disrupt world peace, but the veto prevented other countries from turning the tables in the Security Council upon any one of the Big Five. Thus, the victorious Allies sought to establish a new world order on nothing more substantial than the spirit of camaraderie which the war itself had briefly kindled. The five governments behaved rather like the legendary musketeers who lifted their swords to do justice at the outcry: "All for one and one for all."

Looking back on those euphoric days, one wonders how so infirm an infant as the United Nations could ever have received so auspicious a christening. The supporters of the U.N., then and now, bear a responsibility for having over-

guarantees contained in the historic civil rights legislation which this body last week passed by an overwhelming majority vote.

A story in this morning's New York Times reports that three members of the first group of volunteers participating in the Mississippi summer project are missing. Under the circumstances described in the story, there is good reason to suspect that the three individuals, Michael Schwerner of Brooklyn, Andrew Goodman of Queens, N.Y., and James E. Cheney of Meridian, Miss., have met with foul play.

There are many people throughout this country concerned for the welfare of these volunteers. We have seen voter registration drives in Mississippi before, and we have seen concomitant mob demonstrations, church burnings, violent incidents—even coldblooded murder—accompany these attempts to comply with the Constitution. Now, as another voter registration drive begins in Mississippi, will we again witness the beatings, mass arrests, and killings by citizens and officers of the law who participate in, or by their unconscionable silence abet, these outrageous actions.

What will prompt the Federal Government, short of large-scale violence, to take the necessary steps to insure the safety of these volunteers in Mississippi? The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights has repeatedly stressed the gravity of the situation in Mississippi, and the role that fear of physical violence at the hands of local white persons in control of the State and local political machinery plays in preventing qualified Negroes from registering to vote. The fact is that only 1 percent of the Negro population in Mississippi is registered to vote.

The 1961 report of the Mississippi Civil Rights Commission points out that:

Many and at times almost unbelievable reports of atrocities and brutalities perpetrated by elected and appointed public officials in the capacity of law enforcement officers and under color of law were received by the committee, which forwarded them to the Commission office. Many of these reports were made in affidavit form. Many additional complaints were received which simply could not be investigated because of insufficient time.

I cannot believe that the Justice Department will not use its authority, influence, and legal machinery to offer every protection to the students in Mississippi. But action must be taken now, before those prepared to commit violence are able to carry out their intentions. So long as adequate protection is afforded by the Mississippi State Police, and law and order is maintained, the actions of the Justice Department and the Federal Government need play only a supplemental role, an added guarantee that violence will not be committed. But the Federal Government should be prepared to take quick and effective action to see that order is restored if the past pattern of violence and riots in Mississippi is repeated.

There is no doubt that the Justice Department does have the authority to

prevent interference with voter registration or interference with the constitutional rights of another individual. The FBI and U.S. marshals may be employed to arrest persons who interfere with the lawful exercise of an individual's constitutional rights.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a memorandum relating to the legal powers of the Federal Government in enforcing civil rights, prepared by the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, be printed in the Record.

Unless civil rights laws already on the statute books receive effective and prompt enforcement, the bill we passed last week will become a "dead letter," and civil rights, in those areas and States where the guarantees of equality are needed most, will become a mockery.

I have received, and I am sure that other Senators have received, letters from individuals and parents of individuals participating in the Mississippi summer project. They reflect an awareness of the personal danger every one of these volunteers faces. The public deserves to be made aware of the danger of the threat posed by 60,000 individuals in Mississippi armed with machineguns and hand grenades.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that several communications which I have received in the last few days expressing fears for the safety of the summer volunteers in Mississippi, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TEANECK, N.J., June 16, 1964.
The Honorable HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WILLIAMS: It is a tragic commentary on our country that it is necessary for me to write to my Senators to ask that they take steps now so that my son will not be murdered.

My son is David Trimble. Next semester—if he has a next semester—he will be a sophomore at Clark University in Worcester, Mass., where he did honors work in his first year. His life is threatened simply because he has volunteered for the Mississippi project of the combined civil rights organizations in that State. As you know, the program centers on conducting freedom schools and citizenship training for Mississippi Negroes.

This wholly legal endeavor, directly comparable to our Peace Corps projects all over the world, is deadly dangerous in Mississippi. The passions aroused among white racists are beyond the control of the legal forces of the State and its communities even if, and as you know it is a very large if, they do not side with the mobs.

I am asking, therefore, that you exert every effort now before tragedy occurs to insure that the Government of the United States intervenes quickly and effectively to prevent massacre in Mississippi.

Inevitably my first concern is for my own son but much more is at stake. Mississippi this summer and what Washington does or does not do will stand as a test of the real stuff of our democracy for the whole Nation and the whole world. We—each one of us—cannot be found wanting.

I am counting on you.

Sincerely and with deep concern,
GLEN W. TRIMBLE.

MAPLEWOOD, N.J., June 21, 1964.

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Our son, Mark Victor Tushnet, a junior at Harvard, is going to Mississippi to participate in the project for the upgrading of Negro schooling there.

Reports in the press indicate that this humanitarian and truly American project will be met with violence, with the connivance of the local governments and of the State of Mississippi.

Senator WILLIAMS, I call on you to demand Federal protection on the spot for our son and for the other students who are so unselfishly giving up their vacations to help their fellow men. As you know, there are several other students from Maplewood and its vicinity, as well as others from other parts of New Jersey, going to Mississippi. You have the prestige and the influence to see to it that they will be safe from bodily harm this summer.

I urge you to use your good offices to have the Attorney General send in Federal marshals now before any incidents occur.

Very truly yours,

LEONARD TUSHNET, M.D.
FANNIE TUSHNET.

NEWARK, N.J., June 21, 1964.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: As residents in the State of New Jersey, we are requesting that you ask President Johnson to immediately send U.S. marshals to the State of Mississippi, to protect the young people from all over the United States, including many from New Jersey, who are on their way to that State to help educate the underprivileged there, and to help register qualified American citizens, so that they may in fact exercise their full rights as citizens.

It is imperative that you act now—these young people are not going to demonstrate in the streets of Mississippi, but already it is known that violence is being planned by certain groups in that State and the lives of the students are at stake. It will be too late to act once the violence starts, and we believe that the Federal Government of the United States has a sacred duty to protect its citizens. We are sure that you are aware of the fact that the local and State police authorities in Mississippi will be unwilling or unable, or both, to control what can be another disgrace to the democratic institution we hold so dearly.

We beg you to act now.

Respectfully,

FLORENCE GLEICHER,
SOL GLEICHER.

BLOOMFIELD, N.J., June 2, 1964.

HON. HARRISON WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I respectfully request all assistance available protect dedicated young people entering Mississippi on civil rights mission. In view of possible horror of what awaits them imperative in name of justice and humanity urgent steps be taken at Federal level to supplement or supersede ineffective protection by local authorities.

PAUL HEYMAN.

TEANECK, N.J., June 22, 1964.

Senator H. A. WILLIAMS, JR.,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Our son will be going into Mississippi tomorrow with Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee trying to achieve the privilege of voting for those who have been

1964

sold it to the American people. From the outset, we should have stressed that the U.N. by itself lacked the power to preserve world peace, having no means of its own to finance its operations, or to impose its will; that the Security Council could only act with the unanimous consent of its permanent members, the five victorious powers; that the General Assembly could pass resolutions, but could hardly enforce them; that the U.N. was not, in any sense, a world government, and could not accurately be described as the "Parliament of Man." We should have emphasized that, in keeping the peace and protecting our national interests, the U.N. could be no substitute for our own Armed Forces, our nuclear deterrent, our regional alliances, or our mutual assistance programs abroad.

Having said all this, we could then have endorsed the United Nations for realistic reasons—as a useful instrument through which the sovereign nations of the world might strive to build better procedures for achieving the peaceful settlement of international disputes; and as the one forum that could hold out the promise, as it grew in strength and stature, of ultimately replacing today's rule of violence with tomorrow's rule of law.

2. EXTREMIST OPPOSITION TO U.N. MIGHT HAVE BEEN TEMPERED

If, following the San Francisco conference, we had made this kind of factual case for our entry into the United Nations, I believe the treaty would still have been easily ratified in the Senate, and the American people would not have been left to nurse the exaggerated expectation that the U.N. would prove to be a panacea for peace. Then, perhaps, the failures of the U.N., which were bound to come, would not have loomed so large. Much disillusionment could have been avoided. And fewer today would be the voices attracted to that mindless chant: "Get the United States out of the U.N., and the U.N. out of the United States."

Then, perhaps, we would not now be faced with the leading contender for the Republican presidential nomination, harboring views toward the United Nations which seem to swing between open hostility and critical indifference.

I say parenthetically, inasmuch as I am referring to quoted statements of our colleague from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], that I have placed a copy of this speech in his office. I notified him yesterday that it was my intention to make the speech. We engaged in a conversation at that time. He told me that, if possible, he would try to come to the floor this afternoon.

I merely wish to make the Record clear that I tried to give him the courtesy of advance notice that this address would be made at this time, and that I intended to make reference to his stated views in this way.

As late as May of last year, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER was advocating the outright withdrawal of the United States from the U.N. He is quoted as having said:

Frankly I think the fact that it's proven to be unworkable is grounds enough for us to quit wasting our money on it.

When asked if he would favor our getting out if elected President, he replied:

I would, at this bet, having seen what the United Nations cannot do, I would have to suggest it.

At other times, the Senator has been quoted as saying that perhaps we should remain in the United Nations, despite its ineffectiveness, in order to try to improve it. But, again, in Hartford, last October, GOLDWATER announced at a press conference that we should quit the U.N. if Red China were admitted.

The Arizona Senator has been harshly criticized by fellow Republicans for his negative attitude toward the U.N., and it may be that his thinking is undergoing still another transformation. A few days ago, following a meeting with former President Eisenhower, the Associated Press quotes GOLDWATER as saying, "I believe in the United Nations," adding that he felt some way must be found to revise the Charter to eliminate the "one nation, one vote" principle which it now obtains in the General Assembly. The ambiguity of his position is then compounded, for he concedes the Russians would veto such a change, but contends we must try anyway, because "the chances of Red China coming into this organization grow every day."

In view of the confusing and contradictory statements GOLDWATER has made, the American electorate is entitled to a clear and comprehensive explanation of the candidate's present position on the United Nations. President Johnson has declared it to be his policy, as it was President Kennedy's policy before him, to give unswerving support to the United Nations. The President knows full well that this organization is vital to our own national needs, as well as to the needs of other nations. He appreciates that, once the United Nations is seen in its proper light, the wonder is not that it has accomplished so little, but that it has accomplished so much.

3. THE U.N. AS MEDIATOR

It was our good fortune that the U.N. somehow managed to survive the precipitous breakup of the wartime alliance which had pasted it together. As cold war enmity divided the victors into two camps, the Security Council, which was supposed to serve as the enforcement arm of the U.N., was quickly manacled by the use of the veto. But most of the member countries were determined that the U.N. should not be so readily rendered impotent, and they found a way, within the Charter, to upgrade the role of the General Assembly. The U.N. remained relevant, after all, as a sentinel for peace.

Nevertheless, it seemed, for a time, that the cold war might limit the United Nations to the function of a sounding board for the smaller countries, and a convenient meeting place where the channels of communication could be kept open for the use of the major powers in periods of crisis. Indeed, the U.N. has played a most useful role in this respect, which I do not mean to belittle.

I recall, in 1949, while we were airlifting supplies into blockaded Berlin, how informal talks between our U.N. representative, Philip Jessup, and the Soviet's Jacob Malik, began in the U.N. diplomats' lounge. In this casual setting, Malik first hinted that Moscow might be willing to end the blockade, and here the talks were pursued which eventually led to that result.

Even more dramatic was the mediating role of the U.N. during the dread Cuban missile showdown of 1962. The Russian veto could not prevent the Security Council from serving as a stage on which the United States could tellingly present, before the assembled nations of the world, indisputable evidence of Soviet mendacity, thus helping to galvanize world opinion behind the audacious action President Kennedy had announced he would take. The good offices of the U.N. then served to bring our Ambassador, Adlai Stevenson, and John J. McCloy, into continuing contact with Soviet envoy Kuznetsov, for negotiations in which the Secretary General of the United Nations, U Thant, himself, played a vital part. Ambassador Stevenson sums it up this way:

At a critical moment, when the nuclear powers seemed to be set on a collision course, the Secretary General's intervention led to the diversion of the Soviet ships headed for Cuba and interception by our Navy. This was an indispensable first step in the peaceful resolution of the Cuban crisis. The mere existence of an impartial office which could perform such a service in the middle of the night at such a time, is no small asset to the human race.

So it has happened that the United Nations, while not serving its originally intended role as policeman for the victors, has served as their mediator instead, helping in this way to keep the cold war from turning hot.

4. THE U.N. AS A FIRE BRIGADE

Though nuclear suicide has thus far been averted, brush fire wars have not, and these peripheral struggles will continue to endanger the tenuous stability which rests so delicately upon the present nuclear stalemate.

These are the kind of wars with which we are most likely to be faced, now and in the future. In dealing with these flareups, the U.N. has developed a role, not confined to mediation, which embraces active participation as a kind of fire brigade.

It started in Korea in 1950, when force was invoked under the U.N. flag to defend this nation against invasion. To be sure, most of the troops involved were American and South Korean, and all operated under U.S. command, but the fact that the mission was carried out in the name of the United Nations, and did entail token forces from a host of countries, undoubtedly helped to keep the Soviet Union away from a direct confrontation with the United States. Moreover, the U.N. auspices did much to mobilize world opinion against the aggression, and warned the Communists of the widespread disfavor that future aggression would incur, to a degree that American unilateral action never could have accomplished.

The limited participation of the U.N. in the Korean war led it to become centrally involved as the principal fireman in snuffing out the fighting at Suez in 1956. This was an unusual cold war conflict, since it found the United States and the Soviet Union on the same side opposing the action which had been taken by France and the United Kingdom. This time a way was found to send in troops under a U.N. command, furnished by the smaller member nations, whose mission it was to restore peace and order inside Sinai and along the Gaza Strip. The presence of these impartial sentinels to patrol the seething boundary between Egypt and Israel proved acceptable to both countries, and enabled the French and British to disengage without disgrace. As Senators know, U.N. forces still remain in Sinai and Gaza, where they have been successful, thus far, in preventing any new eruption along this uneasy border.

The biggest fire brigade operation yet undertaken by the United Nations occurred in the Congo. It is anticipated that the mission there will have been completed, and the remaining U.N. troops withdrawn, by the end of this month. Here again, the intervention of the U.N., at the request of the Congolese Government, was indispensable to the restoration of some semblance of order out of a chaos which threatened to engulf all of central Africa. Had we gone in alone to do this job, as some of our shrill U.N. critics advocated, I daresay we would find ourselves today in the same bottomless quagmire, faced with the same dreary prospects, with which we are in truth confronted in South Vietnam.

The latest alarm that U.N. firemen have answered was sounded on the sunny, but incendiary island of Cyprus. It remains to be seen whether the U.N. forces, responding to the call, can extinguish the fighting in this explosive situation, but our best hope still lies with the presence of the soldiers who wear the U.N. beret, now patrolling the tenuous lines separating Greek and Turk on this distraught island.

We should not overlook the fact that every U.N. peace-keeping operation involving the use of military force has been different. The size and composition of the forces have varied enormously. Therefore, it seems best, at this point, not to press for some kind of permanent—and expensive—standing army for the U.N., but to work for a flexible call-up system. Under this system, a number of countries would earmark, and hold available for U.N. use, various numbers and kinds of troops to which the U.N. could turn, when the need should arise.

Canada was one of the first to do this, and has already designated a battalion for U.N. use. Sweden is considering legislation to set up a special reserve unit for the U.N. Norway, Denmark, and Finland are also planning to establish units which could total over 4,000 men, with equipment, including helicopters and transport vessels. The Netherlands has offered a contingent of marines which would be available on 24-

hour notice, plus other troops as needed. The Shah of Iran is reported to have said that his country would be prepared to set aside standby troops for U.N. use. And we have reason to hope that many other nations will make similar offers.

5. THE LESSONS OF U.N. SUCCESS

The notable peacemaking missions of the U.N., in Africa and Asia, contain an important lesson we must learn. It is that the U.N. has no race, creed, or color; it is as varied in its composition as the 113 countries that now make up its membership. It is that the U.N. bears no onus for ever having engaged in colonialism or imperialism; it lacks the intrinsic power to menace even little countries, and so it is neither feared nor distrusted by them. Finally, the U.N. is a genuine international organization which does not separate the "have" countries from the "have nots," or the big from the small, the strong from the weak, or the developed from the undeveloped, or the capitalist from the Socialist, or even the Communist. The United Nations has refused to become the handmaiden of any particular alignment or ideology.

If experience proves anything at all, it is that upheaval among the black, brown, and yellow peoples, now emerging in their own right throughout Africa and Asia, is not likely to be assuaged for long through the unilateral intervention of any white nation. The empires which Western power could not hold, that power cannot now pacify. But because the United Nations has proved itself to be theirs, as well as ours, it can often play the role of "honest broker," and even that of the welcome policeman on the beat, when violence breaks out within, or between, the newly independent countries which were so recently the restive possessions of the Western World.

For this reason, it seems to me that we would be well advised to probe all the possibilities for using the peacekeeping machinery of the United Nations, not only in the matter of the smoldering border dispute between Cambodia and South Vietnam, but also in the broader effort to end the fighting in Laos and South Vietnam itself, under some form of negotiated settlement. Administered by the U.N. such an accord might succeed in preserving the independence of these countries, guaranteeing their neutrality, and permitting them to peaceably proceed to fashion their own destinies through self-determination.

If it should take a special session of the General Assembly to explore these possibilities, then I think such a session should be called, leaving to the next regular session, without prejudice to any country concerned, the problem of dealing with the financial default of certain member states, through invoking the penalty prescribed by article 19 of the Charter. I intend to discuss this fiscal problem facing the U.N. later in the address.

6. THE NATION-BUILDING ROLE OF THE U.N.

One cannot appreciate the scope or significance of what may be called the changing role of the United Nations, without a look at the positive work in which it has become engaged. The widening gap in living standards between the

rich nations and the poor, which, in the main, separates those countries of predominantly white population from the colored, lies like a time bomb beneath our superficial efforts to preserve stability and peace. Unless this gap can be held in check and then narrowed in the years ahead, the time may come when the ideological differences dividing the Western World will be swept aside, as the affluent white nations join common cause against the looming specter of racial war.

To help avoid this catastrophe, the United Nations is at work, channeling both know-how and capital from the rich industrial countries to the poor and undeveloped. Seventeen out of every twenty U.N. employees are engaged in these programs of social progress and economic growth. Through the U.N. World Health Organization, tropical diseases are under relentless attack, malaria is about to be eradicated from the face of the earth. Various U.N. agencies are making loans and technical guidance available to promote monetary stability and long-range economic development—the World Bank, the International Finance Corporation, the International Development Association, the International Monetary Fund, the Technical Assistance program, and the Special Fund.

As for our own foreign aid program, nothing gives us greater trouble than trying to reconcile our belief that improving living standards is a goal in itself, which will serve our ultimate national interests by promoting general stability, with the awkwardness of extending American grants and loans to countries which are engaging in policies that we regard as inimical to our immediate interests. This is not only hard for the American people to understand, but it is equally incomprehensible to the recipient governments. Our own people conclude that we are embarked upon the folly of trying to buy friends, while the foreign governments concerned suspect that we are offering them money to make them subservient, and so either demand the money without strings attached, or engage in that now-familiar game of diplomatic blackmail, striving to obtain their own terms by playing us off against the Russians.

This experience, coupled with the fact that other rich nations should bear their share of the cost, has caused the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to recommend that the United States shift its emphasis—from a bilateral basis to a multilateral basis—in the making of long-term loans for economic development. This would mean expanding the role of the U.N. agencies, an objective I strongly favor, not only for political reasons, but for sound business reasons, as well. Eugene Black, who so ably managed the affairs of the World Bank, has explained the success of investments made through the U.N. lending agencies, in these words:

Because they are known to have no ulterior motive, they can exert more influence over the use of a loan than is possible for a bilateral lender; they can insist that the projects for which they lend are established on a sound basis, and—most important—they can make their lending conditional upon

commensurate efforts being made by the recipient country itself.

Mr. President, in your home community, a loan extended on hard terms by a self-styled friend is usually resented by the person receiving it, although the same person would expect such terms from the local bank. It is no different in the community of nations.

7. THE FISCAL CRISIS OF THE U.N.

Today, as we have seen, the U.N., through the technical, medical, scientific, and financial aid it extends to the underdeveloped areas of the world, is broadly engaged in nation-building, as well as in peace-preserving labors. The organization grows each year in value to the human race. So we must not let the internal problems which now beset the United Nations go unresolved.

Chief among these is the fiscal problem. It is no secret that failure, for one reason or another, of many members to pay their assessments for the U.N. peacekeeping operations in the Congo and the Middle East has brought a financial crisis to the U.N.—and not only a financial crisis; this year the U.N. is passing through a political and constitutional crisis. The Soviet Union is now, for the first time, so far behind on its assessments that it has run right into the provisions of the U.N. Charter which deal with financial delinquency.

The charter is crystal clear. Article 19 says:

A member of the United Nations which is in arrears in the payment of its financial contributions to the Organization shall have no vote in the General Assembly if the amount of its arrears equals or exceeds the amount of the contributions due from it for the preceding 2 full years.

Mr. President, you will notice that there are no "ifs, ands, or buts." A nation which is 2 years behind "shall have no vote." Other nations are today in the same position as the U.S.S.R., though most, if not all, are expected to pay before the next regular session of the General Assembly. But the Soviet Union has said that it is not going to pay its assessments for peacekeeping in the Congo and the Middle East. The U.S.S.R. thinks that when the showdown does come, many nations will be afraid of depriving Russia of her vote, and that some way will be found to "chicken out" on these very specific provisions of the charter.

I think the charter means what it says. Any other construction would undermine the essential integrity of the U.N., which we have worked so assiduously to build over the past 18 years. If any member is permitted to flout the rules of the U.N. without suffering the penalty the rules themselves prescribe, internal disintegration will set in. The Congress of the United States has made its own position unmistakably clear: the Soviet Union must either pay what she legitimately owes, or relinquish her vote in the General Assembly. We can take no other stand.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, at this point, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. As I understand, the Soviet Union has about 3 votes in the United Nations, because of what proved to be an unreasonable concession which was made at the time when the United Nations was organized. So that would mean the Soviet Union would lose all three of those votes, would it not?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes, as I understand it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But she would not lose her vote on the Security Council, would she?

Mr. CHURCH. No, not her vote on the Security Council.

But in my opinion, this matter is so important to the United Nations that I believe the article 19 penalty must be enforced if the Soviet Union continues to refuse to pay what is due from her.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. On that point, I agree entirely with the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator very much.

However, Mr. President, the crisis caused by the problem of paying for special U.N. peacekeeping missions goes deeper than collecting past defaults. Some method must be found for giving those countries which bear most of the cost a commensurate voice in determining what the financing formula for projected new missions should be. It is now theoretically possible for a two-thirds majority of the General Assembly to be formed by nations with only 10 percent of the world's population, or who contribute, altogether, a mere 5 percent of the assessed budget. It does not bode well that such a group, made up primarily of smaller states, could conceivably demand a course of action for which other nations would bear the primary responsibility and nearly all the cost.

For present purposes, the best answer to this dilemma, I submit, does not lie with the proposal that all General Assembly votes should be weighted to reflect population, or wealth, or level of contributions, or some combination of these and other factors. The concept of "one country, one vote" is rooted solidly to the idea of sovereign equality which no nation, large or small, seems yet ready to abandon.

Rather, the answer would seem to lie in the direction of establishing some kind of appropriations committee of the General Assembly which would be charged with determining the most suitable financing plan in each situation. On such a committee, the views of the larger contributors to the cost of U.N. peacekeeping could be given more adequate consideration. This kind of arrangement could assure a better balance in U.N. financial decisions between those who carry the principal cost and responsibility for the keeping of the peace, and the very large number of countries who are the beneficiaries of the peace which has been kept.

8. CONCLUSION

I want to close by urging the informed citizens of this country to interest your-

selves in the United Nations. Do not let the strident voices of the U.N. haters dishearten you. They are a small minority who see the world as a vast Red sea, into which the United States, through insidious betrayal, is steadily sinking.

In their fanciful world, they have closed their minds against the U.N. and even regard it as some kind of Communist tool. If you tell them that the U.N., on its own voting record, has proved itself a friend of freedom—that no Soviet resolution actively opposed by the United States has ever been approved by the General Assembly, they respond that this is but a clever ploy to disguise the true Communist character of the organization. If you remind them that the Soviet Union has had to exercise her veto more than a hundred times in the Security Council, to prevent it from taking action contrary to Russian interests, while the United States has not yet had to cast a single veto vote, they respond, with straight faces, that this proves U.N. procedures were set up to serve the Russians best. If you tell them that their objective of getting the United States out of the U.N. is just what Khrushchev would like to see happen; that it was the shoe-pounding Khrushchev who tried to bully his troika plan through the General Assembly, with the purpose of undermining the office of the Secretary General, so that the U.N. might be rendered as impotent as its predecessor, the League, they grow angry and abusive as they grope for the answers they cannot find. No, these anguished people can never be persuaded.

But fortunately, the great bulk of our people are better balanced and better informed. Commonsense tells them that, despite the diversity among nations, we all share a common interest in survival. Most Americans would agree with these words of our Secretary of State:

In the world of today any breach of the peace could lead to the destruction of civilization. In the thermonuclear age, any instrumentality with a potential for deterring war can hardly be described as less than indispensable to mankind. In 18 brief years, the United Nations has helped to deter or to terminate warfare in Iran and Greece, in Kashmir and Korea, in the Congo and the Caribbean, and twice in the Middle East, and twice in the western Pacific. It is not fanciful to speculate that any or all of us may owe our lives to the fact that these dangers were contained, with the active and persistent help of the United Nations.

Last December, it was my good fortune to travel to New York with President Lyndon B. Johnson. There, before the General Assembly, I heard him vigorously reaffirm the American commitment to the United Nations, in words reminiscent of those of Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy. He said:

More than ever, we support the United Nations as the best instrument yet devised to promote the peace of the world and to promote the well-being of mankind.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I congratulate the Senator from Idaho on a very timely and eloquent speech. He has summed up more concisely and effectively the real merits of the United Nations than any statement I have heard in recent years. He has rendered a great service to this body and to the public in bringing into better focus the situation with regard to the United Nations.

I should like to ask the Senator one question about his statement with regard to the United Nations and South Vietnam. I should be very pleased if the United Nations could be brought into that situation if I thought it could exercise an effective role. I do not believe that the United Nations is an omnipotent body. As the Senator has well pointed out, it is dependent upon the contributions of its members. I thought the Senator's statement about the contributions of the smaller countries and the proposals of some of them, such as Canada, Denmark, and so on, was excellent. Those countries are already engaged in Cyprus with a sizable group of men and, of course, they are still engaged in the Gaza strip.

The point I wished to make was with regard to South Vietnam, which is in a critical situation at the moment. Things have been going so badly against the forces of the independent South Vietnamese Government that I doubt that it would be feasible to seek to bring the United Nations into that operation at the present time. I am questioning the timing of the suggestion rather than the point that there would be an opportunity. Perhaps at some point there would be an opportunity to employ the services of the United Nations. I have felt that our Government was correct in its judgment of that particular situation. It has said that it is necessary that we lend our assistance to South Vietnam in order to stabilize the situation. If at a later time it could be stabilized and the aggression of the North Vietnamese stopped, a situation might develop in which the U.N. could be effective. I wonder how the Senator would comment upon that suggestion.

Mr. CHURCH. First, I am grateful for the Senator's comment with regard to the speech itself.

With reference to the question the Senator has raised, I would respond in the following way: First, it seems to me that, while we cannot at the moment relax our own efforts in South Vietnam, given the serious situation that now exists there, and the continuing pressures being exerted there by the Vietcong, still I think it is open to us to examine the possibility for the U.N. to play a more significant role there.

The first possibility that occurs to me has to do with the continuing border dispute between Cambodia and South Vietnam. As the Senator knows, that dispute has occasioned much bad feeling, back and forth, when units of the South Vietnamese forces have been charged with penetrating Cambodian soil. The boundary line itself is difficult to determine. There is no patrol along the boundary to prevent these incidents from occurring. So, I think,

first of all, that there is the possibility of a U.N. role in the border area between Cambodia and South Vietnam which need not interfere with the continuing American presence in South Vietnam, with respect to the help we are giving the government of South Vietnam to put down the insurrection in that country.

The second possibility is as follows: The only way that peace can be restored to the whole region is with the approval and support of the countries most immediately concerned—not only the United States, or South Vietnam, or North Vietnam, or Cambodia, or Laos, but also with the acquiescence of China as well.

It is difficult for me to conceive of any permanent arrangement or stability in that region of the world without the acquiescence and consent of China, since China is the great power of the Orient immediately to the north of this great peninsula. It is possible that the good offices of the U.N. could be utilized to explore the prospects for some settlement to which all these countries, including the United States and China, might assent. The U.N. might also perform a role in administering such a settlement that would be acceptable to the countries concerned, guaranteeing the neutrality of the various countries of the region, and permitting them peaceably to realize their own destinies through the orderly processes of self-determination. We do not seem to be exploring the possibility of expanding the U.N. role here, even though I am mindful of practical limitations and the eventuality that such an effort might not prove productive. But I say to the Senator that we shall never know unless we try. I have heard the distinguished Senator from Oregon make that point, time and time again, and I must say that, in this respect, I agree with him.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I find it difficult to disagree with much of what the Senator has said from the theoretical standpoint, but from the practical application, under the circumstances that now exist, if it became current, if the people, particularly the people of South Vietnam, thought we were about to withdraw and turn the matter over to the U.N., it could well cause a crisis in the affairs of the Government of South Vietnam. In other words, I think our determined support at this time is indispensable to the survival of that regime.

Mr. CHURCH. I concur with the Senator in that regard.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. So I think it is a delicate matter to be suggesting under these particular circumstances. That is what I meant when I said it was a matter of timing. If we could establish a firm position in which things were going better for the South Vietnamese and they had greater confidence in their capacity to survive, a consideration of some substitute, by way of the U.N., not only would be tolerable, but I would be favorable toward it, for the reason that I would want no illusions to grow up about

what our ultimate intentions are in South Vietnam. It is not to be a permanent base. It is not to be a colony of this country. We are not to be permanently involved. All we wish to do—and I believe that is the policy of our Government—is to see to it that the independence of South Vietnam is maintained. If conditions were such so that the U.N. could contribute to that purpose effectively, I would be glad to see it done. I am talking about the matter from the practical, pragmatic standpoint, under existing circumstances. I believe that before the U.N. body could be brought into the picture in a very effective way, what I have stated would have to be true. I regret it very much, but it seems to me we are the only power that can assure an essential degree of stability and strength in South Vietnam.

I do not disagree in principle; I disagree with the application of the suggestion under existing circumstances, if I make myself clear.

Mr. CHURCH. The Senator makes himself entirely clear. I must add that we may not be in disagreement at all. It is for the President to determine the timing. I concede the wisdom of the words of General Clay that any nation is likely to get, at the bargaining table, what that nation can hold in the field.

It is certainly to be hoped that the military situation in South Vietnam may improve to the point where the prospects brighten for a peaceful settlement, negotiated under the aegis of the United Nations; but I must say that we cannot permit ourselves to become myopic about the methods we employ in Vietnam. I am concerned lest we eliminate other alternatives to military action alone. I think there is a growing danger that we may do this. I suggest that we must remain constantly alert to the availability of the United Nations. I see little that can be lost in probing the possibility of an enlarged U.N. role. It could be done in such a way as to make it clear, to all concerned, that the United States is not thereby lessening its determination to uphold the South Vietnamese Government against forcible overthrow. It could be done in such a way as to suggest that we are not contemplating any American withdrawal.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With that qualification, I agree with the Senator. I regret that we are in an unhappy role, but since we are really the only strong country left in the free world, I think it is inevitable that we fall heir to these situations. They either will go down the drain or we must step in. It gives this country the appearance of belligerency that it does not deserve. I do not mean that this country has not made mistakes, but I regret that our Government has been cast in a role that we do not deserve; namely, of being a warmonger, of promoting war, of having confidence only in military might. I do not think that is true. This country may have made mistakes, but those mistakes have not been due to defects in our motives, but only in the application of our policy.

In this case the persistence of our people in helping South Vietnam is not due

to the fact that we are a warlike country. We are doing it for the purpose of reestablishing peace. If conditions should arise in which it would be feasible for the U.N. to take over and maintain order, I would be in favor of that.

The Senator mentioned Red China. Of course, Red China, not being a member of the United Nations, would not be included in negotiations. The idea of a conference of 14 nations is being discussed. Under the circumstances, that would be a very proper one to have. Of course, much of this depends on damping down the immediate fire, because in the past 2 weeks it looked like touch and go—as to whether the regime would survive. I am not sure how stable it is now. I am not aware of the current military situation.

The appointment of the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and a leading career officer of the civilian branch, the State Department, is good evidence that the President thinks the situation is most serious, and that he intends to do something about it. It was an excellent appointment.

I am hopeful that such conditions can be established that something less than a military solution is needed.

Nevertheless, I congratulate the Senator. I think he has performed a great service in delivering this speech.

Mr. CHURCH. First of all, I share with the Senator the hope he has expressed that our new Ambassador to South Vietnam will achieve success in his difficult mission.

I hesitate to depart from the subject of my address today, which is the United Nations, to wander very far into a discussion of South Vietnam. Yet, I am very troubled about South Vietnam.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. So am I.

Mr. CHURCH. I have been trying to put my thoughts in order—to prepare a speech specifically directed to South Vietnam and our developing policies there.

Mr. MORSE and Mr. PROXMIRE addressed the Chair.

Mr. CHURCH. I shall be happy to yield in a moment. May I complete my thought first?

I have great trepidation about the talk that is so current these days, to the effect that we must not fight in South Vietnam on Communist terms. Of course, no one can argue with that statement. But, if we consider the implications of the statement, it seems to mean we are going to change the terms of the fight, in the direction of expanding the war.

As I have said, I intend to deliver a separate speech, if I ever can get it written and be satisfied with it, on the subject of South Vietnam.

Under present circumstances, there are about 25,000 hard-core Vietcong in South Vietnam. The army of the government we support is many times that size—several hundred thousand men. The Vietcong is being supplied tenuously, over a long and arduous jungle trail, by runners who carry what they can on their backs, while we supply the Government of South Vietnam with shiploads of the most modern equipment, and pour in hundreds of millions of dollars each year.

Still, we fear the Government of South Vietnam is about to topple.

Now it is said that perhaps we must go further and extend the war to North Vietnam, Laos or northward. What troubles me is that if this war—which is essentially a political war, that can be won only by the people of South Vietnam—is being waged on terms so advantageous, with the enemy restricted to 25,000 hard core Vietcong, how on earth will the situation be improved by extending the war to the north? Will it help to take on the army of North Vietnam?

Do we think that the bombing of North Vietnam will break the spirit of the Government, and cause it to discontinue to aid and abet the insurrection in the south? Why should we? The bombing of North Korea never broke the spirit there. And we bombed every house, bridge, and road until there was nothing left but rubble. Expanding the war is not getting out, Mr. President. It is getting further in.

Wait until we change the terms to the point where Red China feels, as she came to feel in Korea, that her own security has become endangered. Then we may be faced, as we were in Korea, with the Chinese army coming down. Is our memory so short that we have forgotten that, only 2 years ago, China invaded India? Can we be so sure that China will hesitate? She has not hesitated before.

Then what shall we have? We shall have a war so momentous in its consequences, so massive in its character, that the hordes of Chinese troops can only be stemmed with atomic weapons. Then the cry will go up, Mr. President: "Use our nuclear power."

The essential character of the American military forces today is naval and aerial. We have no hordes of troops to match the Chinese in conventional battle.

If we become involved in that region, which is the most remote in the world from the United States, we could waste our troops endlessly in the interminable jungle.

What for, Mr. President? Do you think it will be a war in which world opinion will be on our side? Do we think that the history of the last 20 years means that a white nation is going to be upheld in fashioning the destiny of Asia? Do we think that if we occupy this region with our naked power, we would then have solved the problem? Do we think that the Asians concerned would then say, "We are saved. We are liberated by the Western power, the United States, and her occupation will be our shield"? Why, the tides of history will wash over us in time. For Asia does belong to the Asians now, and will forevermore.

But I did not want to talk about South Vietnam. I came here to talk about the United Nations. Still, I am troubled about where we are going in South Vietnam and how we are thinking this through.

I, too, wish our new Ambassador every possible success.

So far as I know, the policy of our administration thus far is to continue to

give support to the Government of South Vietnam, to help it put down the present insurrection. I am for that policy. I will vote for the added money that may be needed. But I am just setting up some warning posts that had better be pondered if we are to avoid a tragic trail of casualties in Asia, out of all proportion to the vital interests of the United States.

Sometimes, wars must be fought. I am for fighting them where the vital interests of the United States are at stake. But let us be sure. Let us be sure.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield first to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. I rise not to comment on the more recent statement of the distinguished Senator from Idaho, but to commend him on his speech. As the Senator stated, he came here today to speak on the United Nations.

It is a speech that the Senate has needed. It is a constructive speech. It is a positive speech. At the same time, the speech has criticized, and I think very helpfully criticized, the United Nations.

This speech points very properly to the successes of the United Nations. In the second place, the Senator states that we should rely not less on the United Nations, but more. He contends that we should use our ingenuity in finding ways in which the U.N. can help us to seek out ways of achieving greater peace in the world. It was an excellent speech.

I am not a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. This is not a part of my special knowledge or responsibility; but I am very grateful to the Senator from Idaho, who is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, and chairman of the U.N. subcommittee, for his very constructive speech. It has been very helpful.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator very much. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator.

And I think the United Nations is so important to our country, and to the rest of the world, that the American people are entitled to a clarification of the views of the man who now seems most likely to be the Republican candidate for President.

His views on the U.N. are of vital interest to the American people and the people of the world. I call upon him for a clear and definitive statement.

We are told that what he has said before is to be forgotten, and that what appears in the newest pamphlets represents the new GOLDWATER. We are told that his views are changing, and will change even more between now and November. And if he is elected President, we are told he will be responsible, for the presidency is a very responsible job.

I say that now is the time to find out exactly what the position of BARRY GOLDWATER is toward the United Nations. The fate of the country and of the world could depend on it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I do not rise to add to the discussion at this time, other than to commend the Senator from Idaho for what I think will be a historic speech as far as the discussion of the United Nations is concerned. I think it is comparable to the speech of the great Senator Brien McMahon of some years ago on the atomic energy problem that faced mankind then, and still does to some extent.

At a later time I shall express my disagreement with the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and the comments that he has made this afternoon. In my judgment, if we follow that course of action, we can very well favor an end to the United Nations as a force for peace in the world. It will favor the United States in a major war in Asia. We cannot continue the South Vietnam program of the United States, which violates one international commitment after another without ending up in a major war in Asia. Red China will not run for cover.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator very much for his comments. I appreciate the fact that he remained through the course of my address and gave it such earnest attention.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am very glad to yield to my friend.

Mr. PELL. I congratulate the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] on an excellent speech, one which shows the United Nations in context with its contributions to the cause of world peace and stability. It is a particularly useful speech at this time when the occasional drawbacks and weaknesses of the U.N. are being drawn to our Nation's attention.

Senator CHURCH mentioned how in San Francisco in 1945 we originally constructed the United Nations. I was an assistant secretary of the committee working on military enforcement arrangements under articles 43, 44, and 45 of the United Nations Charter at that gathering, and I well recall the enthusiasms and hopes for the brave new world of the future all of us had there.

We went over the history of the League of Nations and sought to avoid the pitfalls that had plagued it. For this reason enforcement responsibilities were given to the Security Council, where the great powers had the veto. It is interesting to note that, while it was then thought advantageous to have the Military Staff Committee report to the Security Council where the veto applied as a means of obviating some of the drawbacks of the League of Nations, we have never been able to use the Military Staff Committee because of the very limitations of the veto. Rather, when it has come to military enforcement measures we have had to resort to the General Assembly where the veto did not apply. In general, it seems to me we have vastly benefited from the United Nations.

There are those who say we have a no-win policy in the United Nations. I believe that is incorrect. If it is a no-win policy, why have the Communists made so many efforts to dilute the power of the

Secretary General and to bring about a troika situation?

If it is a no-win policy, why did the Soviet Union use the veto 100 times?

If it is a no-win policy, it is interesting to note that never once has a major Soviet resolution passed the United Nations over United States opposition.

Those are the facts.

I also commend the Senator from Idaho on his wish for enlightenment as to the views of the Senator from Arizona concerning the United Nations. Like so many other Americans, including Members of the Senate, one finds oneself confused as to what his views are about the United Nations.

Finally, I believe the Senator from Idaho has expressed very well his views with regard to Vietnam. He has put into words the doubts and worries in the minds of many of us. As for myself, I have been trying to weld together my thoughts on this subject.

I fully intend to support the administration on its steps in supporting South Vietnam.

Moreover, I congratulate the administration on its appointment of General Taylor as our Ambassador to Vietnam.

I must add that I have some concern as to the effect of permitting the war in South Vietnam to escalate north into a Korea-type operation. There is little doubt, when we look back at what happened in Korea, that we have no desire to repeat that experiment.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Rhode Island. We might well profit from considering that we are still in Korea, that we still have 55,000 troops on the line there, and that we are still pouring hundreds of millions of dollars a year into Korea to support a garrison state. No solution has yet been found, nearly 12 years after the fighting stopped.

Does anyone believe that our Korean policy, since the end of the war there, has been a success? I say it has not. I say that, even though I believe our armed resistance was necessary at the time, since South Korea had been invaded, in a way which threatened the whole structure of peace under the United Nations.

I only say that we should beware of unnecessary involvement, because Korea teaches us that involvement brings problems, which once assumed, remain the continuing responsibility of the United States. There seems to be no end to the cost.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I rise not only for the purpose of saying a word in commendation of the Senator from Idaho for a thoughtful and thought-provoking address on the United Nations, but also to thank him for the timeliness of his comments. This is more than a comment. What he has said is truly a state paper. He is certainly to be congratulated upon its construction and its far-reaching proposals.

There is a tendency in our country to swing from one side of the spectrum to the other.

About 25 years ago, America was ac-

cused of being isolationist; of wanting to isolate itself from the world. In a sense we did. We paid a heavy price for it.

Then we became a major participant in World War II. I believe it is fair to say that we are in a very large measure responsible for some of the great victories in that war.

After the war we took on the burden of leadership for rehabilitation of a war-torn world. Because it is more difficult to rehabilitate than it is to destroy, many people have lost faith and have become discouraged.

We became used to the leadership role, and some at that point were of a mind that what we proposed was always right. To put it another way, for a period of time we did not want to propose anything or do anything. Now we have a tendency to have a new kind of isolation, when we feel that what we believe is right is the way to do.

I believe there is a much better position to be maintained. The Senator from Idaho has discussed that position today very intelligently.

We have long supported the United Nations. However, it requires more now than mere affirmation of support. The United Nations, like many other institutions, is going through changes. There are many pressures that work upon it. It has its troubles. The Senator from Idaho has listed some of them. Among them are membership, Security Council, and financial problems. I thoroughly agree with the Senator's position on the matter of fiscal policy and financial policy of the United Nations.

The Senator from Idaho is the chairman of the United Nations Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations and as such has conducted many hearings on this subject. He has studied it in detail. It behooves us, as a charter member of the United Nations, to maintain the integrity of the financial structure and, indeed, of the membership structure, of the General Assembly.

The Senator has also mentioned the peacekeeping operations of the United Nations. I am delighted he has done so. This is one situation we do not hear about very often, except when a U.N. detachment or U.N. brigade is attacked.

The U.N. peacekeeping operations have saved this Government and this Nation billions of dollars. More importantly, it has saved us our sense of dignity and decency.

I have often thought how the Scandinavian troops must feel, or how the Irish troops must feel, when they serve in the Congo. I visited the Gaza strip and there saw Norwegian soldiers. They were a great distance from Norway. Swedes, Norwegians, Irishmen, Tunisians, Moroccans, and many others, are serving in the field. Those nations have lost lives in carrying out the peacekeeping operations of the United Nations.

Indians have done the same thing, very significantly, in the Congo, and again in Cyprus.

I am pleased that emphasis has been placed upon the peacekeeping operations of the United Nations. It is in our national interest to have the United Na-

tions maintain such peacekeeping operations.

The Senator has made a very sensible proposal with respect to the flexible callup system. It should merit the wholehearted support of the Government, particularly of the Senate.

I wish to add one word with respect to the suggestion that the Appropriations Committee recommend larger financial contributions to the United Nations.

This is a very worthy suggestion. On the one hand, it does not violate the one-nation, one-vote principle. On the other hand, it takes into consideration the practical situation, wherein certain countries, the Western nations in particular, are required to pay a large share of the costs of this sort of proposal, and end by having little or nothing to say about the arrangements.

So I heartily commend the Senator from Idaho for once again bringing out on the floor of the Senate the importance of the United Nations as an international instrument for the keeping of the peace and the building of the peace. President Kennedy reminded us that peace was a process. Sometimes it is a painful process. There are those who are strong advocates of peace but who do not want to go through any of the pain and do not want to go through the trials and tribulations of working and sacrificing for peace.

There are those who will salute the United Nations, on the one hand, but condemn it because it does not bow to our wishes within 24 hours, on the other hand.

I hope the Senator from Idaho will permit me to make another observation. I believe the Senator has performed a useful service in calling to our attention the views of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], whose views have been many and varied on several occasions. I am interested in them, even as they may develop and change. What I believe is more important, since I do not expect that the Senator from Arizona will become President of the United States, is that the majority party in Congress and the responsible members of the minority party really embrace the United Nations as a viable instrument of foreign policy and national security policy.

It is much more important that the Senator from Idaho make his views as clear as he has today—and they are consistent views, because of his responsible position in this body—than it is for us to worry about the variations and variables in the views of candidates. The Senator from Idaho is in a strategic position. He has served in the United Nations and is chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organization Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations, which embraces the United Nations. His views are respected. His word is of importance.

The goal of a new awareness of the United Nations is timely. I hope the Senator will permit me to make this observation: I was interested in his statement about Korea. It is a fact, of course, that we are still deeply involved in Korea. I feel troubled, as the Senator has put it, over some of the developments in Korea. I have felt that way for a long

time. But I fear that we shall face these troublesome problems for many years to come. This is not to say that we should not try to find better ways to handle them. But the problem of world leadership and responsible leadership today leaves us no easy alternatives. This is a world that has gone through an unbelievable revolution. It has gone through one eruption after another, and it will continue to do so.

I have been of the opinion for a long time that we have paid far too little attention to India as one of the possible counterforces to Communist China. We quibble over India. We argue over dollars when, in fact, India is possibly the one power in all of Asia that can counteract the power of Communist China.

The fact that India does not want to meet that power head on is not unusual, because India has staggering problems within its own frontiers. But the Indians have demonstrated that they will fight if they are intimidated. They will stand up.

I am of the opinion that until we start to view southeast Asia policy as a regional policy affecting a total area, and not merely look at Vietnam or Laos or Cambodia, and begin to develop a policy that is in concert with and offers real national security in that whole area, we shall not be developing a policy that will give us comfort or safety.

I was pleased with the President's announcement today of the nomination of Gen. Maxwell Taylor as our Ambassador to South Vietnam. General Taylor is not merely a general; he is considered by people throughout the world to be one of the most thoughtful, mature, responsible individuals in the service of this Nation. I do not believe that the appointment of a general means that we have placed only a military man in this position. General Marshall was a great general, but there was no greater civilian than he. Great generals like Walter Bedell Smith and Omar Bradley served as diplomats, as administrators, and as civilian officers of the Government with unusual brilliance and distinction. The truth is that some of our generals have more of a civilian orientation than some of our civilians.

What I worry about now is the criticism of the U.N. that comes from some civilians who are reserve generals, not the active ones.

I do not mean to move off into a full discussion of Vietnam, because I do not feel capable of doing so; I regret that I have never fully had the opportunity to study that area. It is something that each of us ought to do. There are Members of this body who are much more informed on Vietnam than is the Senator from Minnesota. I do not favor accelerating the war. I believe I can say that this Government does not. I believe that there are responsibilities for the United Nations along the line of what the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, has said today with respect to the area of southeast Asia. I am of the opinion that what we are seeking to do is not merely to buttress military power in

South Vietnam, because, as the Senator from Idaho has put his finger on it, this is a political struggle, not a mere military struggle. We need the military, but we cannot win the struggle with military power alone. We have had adequate proof of that.

What is needed in Vietnam is a cause for which to fight, some sort of inspiration for the people of South Vietnam to live for and die for. What is needed is good administration. This Government is making a determined effort along the lines of strengthening the administration and helping to develop a policy of what might be called domestic orientation for agriculture, education, and labor.

For example, our Government has been working closely with the South Vietnamese Government in helping free trade unions to work with free trade unions in the United States to develop a better trade union base. We are working to develop farm cooperatives. Perhaps that is a little late, but we are beginning to do that. One of the most successful programs in our whole area of foreign aid is the rice and pig program of the AID Administration. Our AID representatives are never molested, even though some of our military personnel are.

At long last we are beginning to understand, as the Senator from Idaho has succinctly said today, that this is a political struggle. One of the real problems in the United States is that we have really never understood the importance of the political wars, the political battles, that take place. We confront these situations as major military operations when, in fact, the military is incidental to the struggle. Military operations may be vital, but they are not the total struggle.

What the Senator from Idaho has said today in his message is clear proof that he feels that the major struggle is political, is social, and that in this struggle the United Nations has a distinct role to play. We cannot possibly succeed as a nation in any of these areas unless we work through the United Nations or some similar organization. To come in with our own hands white, as the Senator from Idaho has made clear, perhaps sometimes a bit dirty, does not suffice.

If ever there was a need for a clear statement, once again, of the vital role of the United Nations with respect to the security of the United States of America, it is at this very hour, as we approach the great election period in this Nation, when we shall be making some fundamental decisions. I only hope that the speech of the Senator from Idaho will be broadly reported. I trust that it will be read by those who have been somewhat delinquent in their loyalties to, and their interest in the United Nations. I trust the Senator's speech will rekindle the fires of enthusiasm for the United Nations.

I thank the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his kind remarks.

Over the years, he has been a consistent friend of the United Nations. He is a very great Senator. One day, when his service is over, I think it will be

14296

remembered, above all else, as a labor for peace and human rights. It is hard for me to conceive of two more important causes to which to dedicate one's life.

I thank the Senator very much.
Mr. President, I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT OF MATERIALS RESERVE AND STOCKPILE ACT OF 1964 TO PROVIDE FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATIONAL AND HEALTH INSTITUTIONS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on April 24, I gave notice that I would seek to amend S. 2272, the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964, to increase substantially a major program of Federal aid to our Nation's educational and health institutions.

The senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] has contributed greatly by reporting the Materials Reserve and

Stockpile Act, and has widely handled that very complex situation.

However, my amendment would provide that material in the national stockpile, found to be surplus to present need, could be released only after it had been offered for donation to schools and hospitals under the donable surplus property program on the same basis as other Federal surplus property. The amendment has been redrafted, in order to conform to the bill as reported.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the language of the amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 30, line 5, immediately after "paragraph 6", insert: "and to the provisions of section 203 (j)."

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, when he was Secretary of the Department of

Health, Education and Welfare, Dr. Arthur S. Flemming stated that the donable program is one of the most important aids to education in the United States. This was borne out by statements from educators from throughout the United States at a hearing held on April 3, 1962, by the Special Donable Property Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations.

From 1946 through June 30, 1963, this program has made personal and real property with a total acquisition cost of almost \$4.4 billion available to public health and education institutions and civil defense organizations in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa and Guam. I ask unanimous consent that a table, breaking down this total by States be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

TABLE I.—Personal property made available for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations and real property disposed of to public health and educational institutions, 1946 through June 30, 1963 (acquisition cost)

States	Personal property	Real property	Total	States	Personal property	Real property	Total
Total.....	\$3,477,310,878	\$915,311,016	\$4,392,621,894	Nevada.....	59,060,058	\$2,323,156	\$11,383,214
Alabama.....	99,818,802	15,400,007	115,218,809	New Hampshire.....	14,228,548		14,228,548
Alaska.....	7,754,128	3,268,815	11,022,943	New Jersey.....	59,489,045	916,863	60,405,908
Arizona.....	33,252,813	8,301,591	41,554,404	New Mexico.....	25,353,629	9,581,885	34,935,514
Arkansas.....	35,628,759	27,400,045	63,028,804	New York.....	222,944,345	83,556,857	306,501,202
California.....	407,144,138	68,286,378	475,430,516	North Carolina.....	100,610,986	20,875,476	121,486,462
Colorado.....	39,194,478	11,725,401	50,919,879	North Dakota.....	9,099,323	1,189,524	10,288,852
Connecticut.....	47,738,107	2,625,234	50,363,341	Ohio.....	133,056,369	12,350,702	145,407,071
Delaware.....	12,184,060	2,433,651	14,617,711	Oklahoma.....	68,371,360	70,316,650	138,688,010
Florida.....	125,967,607	33,510,919	159,478,526	Oregon.....	54,105,602	14,820,737	68,926,339
Georgia.....	103,383,062	18,793,859	122,176,921	Pennsylvania.....	159,619,165	4,552,450	164,171,615
Hawaii.....	16,685,074	3,249,817	19,934,891	Rhode Island.....	21,145,402	359,143	21,504,545
Idaho.....	20,145,669	22,337,101	42,482,770	South Carolina.....	58,978,550	10,018,847	68,997,397
Illinois.....	124,395,205	22,746,571	147,141,776	South Dakota.....	15,121,099	2,083,534	17,204,633
Indiana.....	72,900,642	3,918,166	76,818,808	Tennessee.....	81,261,005	9,784,191	91,045,196
Iowa.....	33,274,957	2,587,699	35,862,656	Texas.....	170,915,831	160,804,155	321,219,986
Kansas.....	36,588,564	9,690,299	46,278,863	Utah.....	46,372,665	4,731,829	51,104,494
Kentucky.....	61,467,556	4,527,044	65,994,600	Vermont.....	12,813,146	69,911	12,883,057
Louisiana.....	52,506,895	14,362,119	66,869,014	Virginia.....	102,107,948	19,794,080	121,902,028
Maine.....	25,344,762	3,783,216	29,127,978	Washington.....	96,484,384	20,747,262	117,231,646
Maryland.....	77,816,053	3,941,416	81,757,469	West Virginia.....	41,968,614	2,357,157	44,325,771
Massachusetts.....	114,533,978	31,474,948	146,008,926	Wisconsin.....	68,118,173	1,523,420	69,641,593
Michigan.....	91,137,556	22,839,435	113,977,041	Wyoming.....	10,230,110	1,637,206	11,867,316
Minnesota.....	46,765,289	45,685,075	92,450,364	District of Columbia.....	20,671,109	456,234	21,127,343
Mississippi.....	66,824,484	43,780,694	110,605,178	Puerto Rico.....	19,424,317	854,705	20,279,022
Missouri.....	60,656,189	37,022,591	97,678,780	Virgin Islands.....	47,655	3,648	51,303
Montana.....	14,663,602	536,970	15,200,572	American Samoa.....	500		500
Nebraska.....	28,719,501	5,852,083	34,571,584	Guam.....		6,900	6,900

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, during the most recent year for which I have a report, that ended with June 30, 1961, exactly 4,530 health and 32,673 educational institutions participated in the donable surplus property program. I ask unanimous consent to have that report, a State-by-State total furnished by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

TABLE II.—Institutions participating in donable surplus property program during the year ended June 30, 1961

States	Health	Education
National total.....	4,530	32,673
Alabama.....	82	1,274
Alaska.....	11	29
Arizona.....	32	750
Arkansas.....	63	490
California.....	268	1,901
Colorado.....	81	361

TABLE II.—Institutions participating in donable surplus property program during the year ended June 30, 1961—Continued

States	Health	Education
Connecticut.....	37	204
Delaware.....	10	60
District of Columbia.....	8	256
Florida.....	111	112
Georgia.....	397	3,354
Hawaii.....	23	258
Idaho.....	31	138
Illinois.....	354	1,803
Indiana.....	100	979
Iowa.....	88	559
Kansas.....	97	829